

**MINUTES
CITY OF ST. CHARLES, IL
PLAN COMMISSION
TUESDAY, MAY 7, 2024**

Members Present: Peter Vargulich
Laurel Moad
Colleen Wiese
Zachary Ewoldt
Dave Rosenberg
Gary Gruber
John Fitzgerald

Members Absent: Jeffrey Funke
Gina Lawson

Also Present: Ellen Johnson, Planner
Russell Colby, Director of Community Development
Bruce Sylvester, Assistant Director CD-Planning & Engineering
Court Reporter

1. Call to order

Chair Vargulich called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

2. Roll Call

Chair Vargulich called the roll. A quorum was present.

3. Pledge of Allegiance

4. Presentation of minutes of the April 2, 2024 meeting of the Plan Commission

Motion was made by Ms. Moad, seconded by Ms. Wiese and unanimously passed by voice vote to approve the minutes of the April 2, 2024 Plan Commission meeting.

Commissioners agreed to change the agenda order to address Item 6 prior to Item 5.

**6. Cityview Resubdivision (Stonewood Properties and Development LLC)
Application for Minor Subdivision – Final Plat**

The attached transcript prepared by Planet Depos Court Reporting is by reference hereby made a part of these minutes.

Motion was made by Mr. Fitzgerald and seconded by Mr. Rosenberg to recommend approval of an Application for Minor Subdivision – Final Plat for Cityview Resubdivision (Stonewood Properties and Development LLC), subject to resolution of all staff comments.

Roll call vote:

Ayes: Moad, Wiese, Ewoldt, Rosenberg, Gruber, Fitzgerald, Vargulich

Nays: None

Plan Commission

May 7, 2024

Page 2

Absent: Funke, Lawson

Motion carried: 7-0

- 5. The Grove, 5N024 State Rt 31 (FD Fund II LLC)**
Application for Concept Plan

The attached transcript prepared by Planet Depos Court Reporting is by reference hereby made a part of these minutes.

- 7. Public Comment - None**
- 8. Additional Business from Plan Commission Members or Staff - None**
- 9. Weekly Development Report**
- 10. Meeting Announcements**
 - a. Plan Commission
Tuesday, May 21, 2024 at 7:00pm Council Chambers
Tuesday, June 4, 2024 at 7:00pm Council Chambers
Tuesday, June 18, 2024 at 7:00pm Council Chambers
 - b. Planning & Development Committee
Monday, May 13, 2024 at 7:00pm Council Chambers
Monday, June 10, 2024 at 7:00pm Council Chambers
- 11. Adjournment at 8:40 p.m.**



Planet Depos[®]
We Make It *Happen*[™]

Transcript of Hearing Agenda Item 6

Date: May 7, 2024

Case: St. Charles Plan Commission

Planet Depos

Phone: 888.433.3767

Email: transcripts@planetdepos.com

www.planetdepos.com

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

CITY OF ST. CHARLES

PLAN COMMISSION

-----x
Cityview Resubdivision :
(Stonewood Properties and :
Development LLC) : Agenda Item 6
Application for Minor :
Subdivision-Final Plat :
-----x

HEARING

St. Charles, Illinois
Tuesday, May 7, 2024
7:00 p.m.

Job No.: 514868
Pages: 1 - 9
Reported by: Theresa A. Vorkapic,
CSR, RMR, CRR, RPR

1 Hearing, held at the location of:

2

3 CITY OF ST. CHARLES

4 Council Chambers

5 2 East Main Street

6 St. Charles, Illinois 60174

7 630-377-4400

8

9

10

11 Before Theresa A. Vorkapic, a Certified
12 Shorthand Reporter, Registered Merit Reporter,
13 Certified Realtime Reporter, Registered
14 Professional and a Notary Public in and for the
15 State of Illinois.

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

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

A P P E A R A N C E S

PLAN COMMISSION MEMBERS:

Peter Vargulich, Chair

Laurel Moad

Colleen Wiese

Zachary Edoldt

Dave Rosenberg

Gary Gruber

John Fitzgerald

ALSO PRESENT:

Ellen Johnson, Planner, Community &
Economic Development

Bruce Sylvester, Assistant Director of
Community Development, Planning &
Engineering

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

2 MR. VARGULICH: Good evening, everyone.

3 I'd like to call to order of the Plan Commission,

4 City of St. Charles at 7:00 p.m.

5 Laurel Moad.

6 MS. MOAD: Here.

7 MR. VARGULICH: Colleen Wiese.

8 MS. WIESE: Here.

9 MR. VARGULICH: Jeff Funke, Gina Lawson

10 (not present).

11 MR. VARGULICH: Zach Ewoldt.

12 MR. EWOLDT: Here.

13 MR. VARGULICH: David Rosenberg.

14 MR. ROSENBERG: Here.

15 MR. VARGULICH: Gary Gruber.

16 MR. GRUBER: Here.

17 MR. VARGULICH: John Fitzgerald.

18 MR. FITZGERALD: Here.

19 MR. VARGULICH: Perfect. Pledge of a

20 Allegiance, please.

21 (Pledge of a Allegiance recited).

22 MR. VARGULICH: Thank you, everyone.

23 Presentation of the meeting minutes of our

24 April 7, '24 meeting.

1 Is there a motion to approve?

2 MS. MOAD: So moved.

3 MR. VARGULICH: All in favor?

4 (A chorus of ayes).

5 MR. VARGULICH: The order of our next two
6 applications, I'm going to request from the Plan
7 Commission if we reverse those and take ID Item
8 No. 6 first and the Cityview Resubdivision and
9 then we'll do Item 5 afterwards, The Grove. And
10 the reason I'm asking is I think most of these
11 people are here for Item 5 and not Item 6 and it
12 would be nice to move Item 6 along because I think
13 it's going to be a relatively short discussion.
14 If you guys can all just let me know, is that
15 okay?

16 (Committee members in agreement).

17 MR. VARGULICH: All right. We have
18 officially switched those for today. And we'll
19 start with Item 6 which is an application for
20 minor subdivision, final plat, by Stonewood
21 Properties and Development, LLC. We'll begin with
22 a short staff summary.

23 MS. JOHNSON: Thank you.

24 Cityview subdivision is located at the

1 northwest corner of Route 31 and Mosedale Street.
2 Approved in 2018, the subdivision includes four
3 single family lots fronting on Mosedale as well as
4 storm water detention outlet managed by homeowners
5 association.

6 A house has been constructed on Lot 1.
7 Lots 2 and 4 did not get developed. In 2019, city
8 staff approved revised engineering plans for the
9 subdivision which reduced the size of the storm
10 water management basin. The developer Stonewood
11 Properties the development is requesting approval
12 of a Plat 3 subdivision, proposes to reduce the
13 size of the storm water outlet in order to
14 enlarge the rear yards of Lot 2 and 3.

15 The lots will continue to be the same
16 width at Mosedale and along the sides of the house
17 and the lots will continue to be following these
18 standards. The subdivision will continue to have
19 four total buildable plots.

20 The storm water facility has a dry bottom
21 and is expected to remain dry most of the time,
22 however, the high water line encroaches off of the
23 out lot onto Lots 3, 4 in the rear. Staff has
24 required an easement over these portions of the

1 lots. Easement language is meant to make clear to
2 future lot owners that that area, that easement
3 area must be maintained as turf grass and that no
4 structures or fencing, fill or other surfaces or
5 landscaping shall be permitted in the easement.

6 There are no outstanding staff comments
7 and staff recommends approval. And the developer
8 John Cebzynski is here as well if there are
9 questions for him.

10 MR. VARGULICH: Thank you. Any questions
11 from the Plan Commission? No..

12 Is there a motion.

13 MR. FITZGERALD: I'll make a motion.

14 MR. ROSENBERG: Second.

15 MR. VARGULICH: Motion is seconded to
16 approve the application for minor subdivision
17 final plat filed by Stonewood Properties and
18 Development LLC.

19 And then if there are any outstanding
20 staff comments that come up, they will be resolved
21 before the commission.

22 Roll call. Laurel Moad.

23 MS. MOAD: Yes.

24 MR. VARGULICH: Colleen Wiese.

Transcript of Hearing Agenda Item 6

Conducted on May 7, 2024

8

1 MS. WIESE: Yes.

2 MR. VARGULICH: Zach Ewoldt.

3 MR. EWOLDT: Yes.

4 MR. VARGULICH: David Rosenberg.

5 MR. ROSENBERG: Yes.

6 MR. VARGULICH: Gary Gruber.

7 MR. GRUBER: Yes.

8 MR. VARGULICH: John Fitzgerald.

9 MR. FITZGERALD: Yes.

10 MR. VARGULICH: Myself, yes. Thank you.

11 (Item No. 6 concluded)

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1 CERTIFICATE OF COURT REPORTER - NOTARY PUBLIC

2

3 I, Theresa A. Vorkapic, Certified
4 Shorthand Reporter No. 084-2589, CSR, RMR, CRR,
5 RPR, and a Notary Public in and for the County of
6 Kane, State of Illinois, the officer before whom
7 the foregoing public meeting, do hereby certify
8 that the foregoing transcript is a true and
9 correct record of the testimony given; that said
10 testimony was taken by me and thereafter reduced
11 to typewriting under my direction; and that I am
12 neither counsel for, related to, nor employed by
13 any of the parties to this case and have no
14 interest, financial or otherwise, in its outcome.

15 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my
16 hand and affixed my notarial seal this 14th day of
17 May, 2024.

18 My commission expires November 6, 2027.

19

Theresa A Vorkapic

20

21

THERESA A. VORKAPIC

22

NOTARY PUBLIC IN AND FOR ILLINOIS

23

24



Planet Depos[®]
We Make It *Happen*[™]

Transcript of Hearing Topic 5

Date: May 7, 2024

Case: St. Charles Plan Commission

Planet Depos

Phone: 888.433.3767

Email: transcripts@planetdepos.com

www.planetdepos.com

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

CITY OF ST. CHARLES

PLAN COMMISSION

-----x

The Grove, 5N024 State Rd. :
31: (FD Fund II LLC) :
Application for concept :
plan :

-----x

HEARING

St. Charles, Illinois

Tuesday, May 7, 2024

7:05 p.m.

Job No.: 514868

Pages: 1 - 76

Reported by: Theresa A. Vorkapic,
CSR, RMR, CRR, RPR

1 Hearing, held at the location of:

2

3 CITY OF ST. CHARLES

4 Council Chambers

5 2 East Main Street

6 St. Charles, Illinois 60174

7 630-377-4400

8

9

10

11 Before Theresa A. Vorkapic, a Certified

12 Shorthand Reporter, Registered Merit Reporter,

13 Certified Realtime Reporter, Registered

14 Professional and a Notary Public in and for the

15 State of Illinois.

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

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

A P P E A R A N C E S

PLAN COMMISSION MEMBERS:

Peter Vargulich, Chair

Laurel Moad

Colleen Wiese

Zachary Edoldt

Dave Rosenberg

Gary Gruber

John Fitzgerald

ALSO PRESENT:

Ellen Johnson, Planner, Community &
Economic Development

Bruce Sylvester, Assistant Director of
Community Development, Planning &
Engineering

Brendan Penny, Meltzer Purtill & Stelle,
LLC-on behalf of the applicant

1 MR. VARGULICH: Thank you. All right.

2 Item 5. It's a concept plan for The
3 Grove, 5N024 State Route 31, filed by FD Fund II
4 LLC.

5 The purpose of the concept plan review is
6 to allow the applicant to obtain informal input on
7 conceptual development prior to filing formal
8 zoning applications and preparing all the details
9 plans and drawings. The concept plan process also
10 serves as a forum for our citizens and neighboring
11 property owners to ask questions, express their
12 views on this potential development.

13 The procedure tonight will start with an
14 overview by staff followed by the applicant's
15 presentation. After that, the Plan Commission
16 will ask any questions that we may have, and then
17 members of the public if they wish to speak will
18 be given a chance to do so, and then, finally, at
19 the end, the Plan Commission will offer their
20 final feedback.

21 The Plan Commission does not take any
22 action to approve or deny a project at the concept
23 plan stage. After this meeting, the concept plan
24 will be discussed at the planning and development

1 committee of the City Council on Monday May 13.

2 If applicant decides to pursue the project, all
3 their zoning applications will need to be filed, a
4 public hearing will be held and notice to adjacent
5 property owners will happen again.

6 I ask everyone who wishes to speak tonight
7 that they first be recognized and then stand at
8 the lectern, state their name, spell your last
9 name, state your address for the record.

10 I would also like to indicate the city's
11 link for this project had all the documents that
12 everybody had a chance to review in there. There
13 were a number of letters that were submitted to
14 Plan Commission of which this body has had a
15 chance to review. Some came in post on Friday so
16 I just want to acknowledge that staff received two
17 e-mails one from Katie Ryan dated May 5th and then
18 also one from Vivian Van Roekel dated Monday
19 May 6th.

20 There is also a community petition
21 identified as halt construction of the townhome
22 units suggesting reasons for opposition, five were
23 listed. Both staff and planning commission
24 members have all received this now and have copies

1 of it and we appreciate all of your input.

2 This will continue to be part of the
3 public record and it will go to the planning and
4 development committee and will be part of the
5 public record if the project comes back for a
6 preliminary review.

7 So as we get ready to begin, staff can
8 start us, please.

9 MS. JOHNSON: This is a concept plan is
10 for a two and-a-half acre parcel on the west side
11 of Route 31 about two miles north of downtown.
12 The applicant is FD Fund II LLC represented by is
13 Conrad Hurst of Frontier Development.

14 The property is surrounded by single
15 family homes to the north, east and south, to the
16 west is city owned land which encompasses a
17 drainage way running through the Red Gate
18 subdivision. There is also a city owned strip of
19 land directly north of the parcel along White
20 Bridge Drive which is a private road.

21 The property has been vacant since 2002
22 when a house and out buildings were demolished.
23 The property is now moated and appears to be
24 unmanaged for several years.

1 In 2005 the city approved a four-lot
2 single family subdivision for this property
3 however the development did not move forward.

4 The property is zoned RS-1, low density
5 suburban single familiar residential. This zoning
6 allows a maximum density of 2.4 point acres per --
7 2.4 units per acre, proposed rezoning to the RS-2
8 density residential district which would allow for
9 townhomes to be built on the property and it would
10 allow a density of up to 10 units per acre.

11 The comprehensive plan identifies intended
12 land use for this property as single family
13 detached residential, which reflects the
14 predominant land use along this stretch of
15 Route 31. The comp plan calls for single family
16 areas to consist primarily of single family homes
17 in order to protect and enhance the city's
18 existing neighborhoods, however, the comp plan
19 also states that single family areas must remain
20 flexible and considered context.

21 There may be situations where single
22 family attached housing such as townhomes would be
23 appropriate and should be considered on a
24 case-by-case basis.

1 So the concept plan proposes 21 units
2 arranged around a private drive accessed
3 permissible driveway off Route 31 and the
4 applicant will describe the site layout in more
5 detail. Proposed density is 8.8 units per acre.
6 The plan appears to meet all applicable standards
7 of the RM-2 zoning district which is the proposed
8 district. The applicant does not intend to
9 request a planned unit development for the
10 project, but rather a develop under the RM-2
11 zoning.

12 The development will have to meet all
13 applicable design standards, building design
14 standards as well as landscaping standards which
15 includes landscaping a long Route 31 and building
16 foundation landscaping.

17 Staff has included a number of comments,
18 high level comments in the staff report, and I'll
19 list a few of those. One item is that the private
20 drive around the site would be to be is shown as
21 two-way. It would need to be one-way given its
22 width that the fact that on the street parking is
23 proposed one side.

24 There's also a potential off-site trail

1 shown west of the property through the city owned
2 parcels to the west. This would require further
3 study to determine feasibility from an engineering
4 perspective and a cost perspective.

5 It appears additional land area will be
6 needed for the storm water detention facility at
7 the west end. All required storm water detention
8 for this development will need to be accommodated
9 on the property.

10 The drainage way to the northwest which is
11 on city property will need to be evaluated to
12 determine where the high water elevation is to
13 assess flooding potential for this property. The
14 buildings will need to be protected from flooding
15 if necessary.

16 The storm water report will be required as
17 well as a wetland assessment if the project moves
18 forward. It will also need a tree preservation
19 plan as many high quality trees that are existing
20 as possible should remain if possible. A traffic
21 study can be requested. Plan Commission might
22 want to comment on whether you feel a traffic
23 study would be warranted.

24 Also, a townhome owners association will

1 need to be created in order to maintain the
2 private drive and all of the open space around the
3 buildings as well as the detention area.

4 If the applicant chooses to move forward
5 after the concept plan process is over, City
6 Council approval of the zoning would be needed to
7 rezone the property to RM-2 and also preliminary
8 and final plat of subdivision would be needed as
9 well as associated engineering plans.

10 So staff requested the Plan Commission to
11 provide feedback to the applicant focusing on the
12 proposed change in land use from single family to
13 townhomes as well as the rezoning. Feedback can
14 also be provided on site layout connectivity and
15 building design.

16 And I'll turn it over to the applicant to
17 further discuss their plan.

18 MR. VARGULICH: Thank you.

19 MR. PENNY: Good evening, Mr. Chairman,
20 members of the commission. I'd like to thank you
21 first for your time this evening and for allowing
22 us to present this project before your concept.

23 My name is Brendan Penny with the law firm
24 of Meltzer Purtill & Stelle here on behalf of

1 Frontier. My office is located at 125 South
2 Wacker Drive in Chicago.

3 We are here to present as Ms. Johnson just
4 went over with you a 21-unit townhome development
5 on the property historically known as Karsch,
6 which is the vacant lot along Route 31 that we saw
7 just a moment ago.

8 Here with me on behalf of Frontier I have
9 Conrad Hurst. He is a principal. He will walk
10 through the site plan the developments and how we
11 reached that design based on our preliminary
12 discussions.

13 First and foremost, the immediate group
14 that has helped and assisted us in putting
15 together the concept plan and putting together the
16 aspects of this proposal are Frontier and WBK,
17 Chuck Hanlon has been instrumental along with
18 Adam. They sent out site proposal plan than that
19 we will walk through with you this evening,
20 unfortunately he was called away, but it is my
21 understanding he intends to attend on Monday
22 evening.

23 A little background on Frontier, just to
24 familiarize yourselves -- with the city and the

1 mission, Frontier is a family owned real estate
2 developer. They are local to St. Charles in
3 developing and commercial and residential
4 properties licensed in 1992. They have over
5 40 years of combined residential and commercial
6 real estate development experience and that
7 experience is what they use to bring to every
8 project that they develop. So that it fosters a
9 sense of belonging and exquisite designs and it
10 really feels like a part of the fabric of the
11 neighborhood in which it sits.

12 The core of their philosophy is to create
13 long-term community engagement and development
14 that contributes to the social vitality of the
15 regions that are serviced by the project that they
16 put forth.

17 Again, being Frontier is local to
18 St. Charles and this is something that's near and
19 dear to them so this is something that they have
20 approached with care and thought, something that
21 they would like to maintain and put forth that is
22 seen as beneficial by the surrounding community
23 and the city as well.

24 Again, I'd like to briefly summarize just

1 the request for relief. Again, as Ms. Johnson
2 outlined, we are seeking a rezoning of the
3 property. It's currently zoned as RS-1 low
4 density single family residential. We'd like to
5 request for zoning to RM-2 medium density for the
6 purpose of implementing a townhome development
7 community, and then also we will be submitted for
8 preliminary and final plat approval to subdivide
9 the property and create separate lots for each
10 building within the development and outlots for
11 the common areas as well.

12 Frontier has rezoned and put forth the
13 plan that is intended to meet the underlying
14 regulations and standards RM-2 District so we will
15 not also be seeking at this point any variations
16 to those things as well.

17 Again, this a zoomed-in aerial of the
18 existing property which as you can see is wooded.
19 It's vacant. It's on a corner lot. It's been so
20 for over 20 years and it's for this reason we
21 believe that it's well suited for the proposed
22 community.

23 There are some infrastructure challenges
24 to developing the site which of course is

1 attributed to the long standing vacant nature of
2 the property, and I'll let Conrad discuss those as
3 he walks through the site plan with you and that
4 impacted the design, and thought went into
5 planning for you this evening.

6 This is a snapshot of an aerial of the
7 city's zoning map. Again, as was previously
8 mentioned the subject property is surrounded on
9 all sides by lower density residential districts,
10 RS-1 to the south and west, RE-2 which is a
11 residential estate district to the east and then
12 unincorporated residential property in Kane County
13 and further north of additional RS-1 low density
14 single family detached housing.

15 Again, as Ms. Johnson iterated and as we
16 emphasized in our project narrative and as some
17 off you know extensively, the city's comprehensive
18 plan does recognize a need and emphasis for the
19 city to maintain single family detached housing
20 districts, but it's important and if prioritizes
21 also the need for flexibility to address a diverse
22 market for housing in the city which incorporates
23 somewhat higher density townhome uses such as the
24 proposal that we're putting before you.

1 And with that I'll turn it over to Conrad
2 Hurst to walk you through the site plan and some
3 of the discussions we've had with staff to reach
4 this plan.

5 MR. HURST: Good evening. My name is
6 Conrad Hurst with Frontier Development. I live at
7 9 East Main Street, St. Charles, Illinois.

8 We identified this site as an opportunity
9 for a residential development. Honestly from
10 being around town (inaudible) -- but based on some
11 early conversations with staff, we realized there
12 would be some extraordinary land development needs
13 to get infrastructure to the site, which really
14 drove our thought process in developing a concept
15 necessary for the community to support the
16 feasibility of that taking inspiration from
17 successful projects in the area such as Park Place
18 in Geneva and the brownstones in our own downtown,
19 we came up with this concept of The Grove which is
20 before you tonight.

21 Initially we prepared a preliminary site
22 plan that has 23 units which has since been
23 reduced to 21, which allowed us to accomplish
24 several planning objectives which fit within

1 requested zoning, complying with various setbacks,
2 lot size requirements, providing additional land
3 for storm water management and retention.

4 Per city staff, all required storm water
5 blocking for the community shall be constructed on
6 the property. Once final calculations are
7 completed allowing for that basin to be refined
8 and creative options, permeable pavers, green
9 gardens, et cetera, can be constructed as needed
10 to ensure the project has (inaudible) --
11 surrounding storm water management ecosystem.

12 One of the key design elements of this
13 project is all the garages, driveways, vehicular
14 circulation, porches and community gathering
15 spaces with an organized around the central part
16 which allows us to orient the vast majority of the
17 activity within the community.

18 The majority of the community's green
19 space including front yards and substantial wooded
20 landscape form the perimeter of the community.
21 It's hard to say exactly what we will be able to
22 save in terms of trees, but it is certainly our
23 intent to maintain as many noninvasive species as
24 the tree survey and structure will allow

1 especially within the buffer zone of the southern
2 edge of the property there.

3 The only vehicular access to the community
4 is from Route 31, which is an IDOT-controlled
5 roadway, and the impact to the traffic will be
6 studied by IDOT once we get to the point where we
7 make a permit application. Early conversations
8 with elected officials produced a desire for a
9 landscape island separating -- hang on a second.
10 So this was something that was in some preliminary
11 conversations that was part of the original plat,
12 a safety feature for ingress and egress, gives us
13 an opportunities monument the community and it
14 will look very similar to the entrances of the
15 other communities along 31.

16 And then the walking path is shown through
17 the city's open space to the west accomplishes one
18 of the initiatives of the study which is to
19 improve pedestrian connectivity. This would
20 obviously require the cooperation of the city and
21 is not a critical community of the community's
22 success, but seemed to appeal to staff and we
23 thought it was worth presenting for conversation.

24 That's the site plan.

1 MR. VARGULICH: Thank you.

2 MR. PENNY: That largely concludes the
3 presentation for this evening, but I do think it's
4 worth noting that being this is a preliminary
5 stage, we have taken to heart the comments that
6 were made by staff and circulated last week in the
7 staff report, and have already begun discussions
8 on how we can address the needs for those requests
9 and so those would be forthcoming as this plan
10 develops and as we move forward in the process
11 we'd like to address those.

12 Thank you and we look for to hearing any
13 comments the commission has.

14 MR. VARGULICH: Thank you. I'll start
15 with any questions from other commissioners?

16 MS. WIESE: I'm not sure if you're able to
17 share with us what you anticipate the price range
18 for these units to go? It might not be exact but
19 some kind of ball park.

20 MR. HURST: Sure. At the onset, the sales
21 based on premiums, options and escalations it will
22 start anywhere in the mid fours and all the way up
23 to high fours and depending on how sales go
24 through escalations they could go to low fives.

1 It's a broad range. It's concept so that's the
2 intent.

3 MS. WIESE: And they are single family and
4 it was two bedrooms and three bedrooms; is that
5 correct?

6 MR. HURST: Correct.

7 MS. WIESE: Thank you.

8 MR. VARGULICH. Any other questions?

9 MS. MOAD: And the intention is that those
10 will be owner occupied, not rentals.

11 MR. HURST: Absolutely. To the extent
12 that we can control that, we will be selling this
13 to individual owners.

14 MR. GRUBER: Would they be zoned for North
15 High School?

16 MR. HURST: I believe it would be North
17 High School.

18 MR. GRUBER: Elementary, too, so if buses
19 went in there where, where would the bus stop be?

20 MR. HURST: That is a good question. We
21 have to maintain certain turning radius for
22 emergency vehicles like fire trucks so presumably
23 a bus will be able to access the community.
24 That's probably the best answer I can give you at

1 this point. Putting a bus in there includes a
2 turning radius. That's something we can explore
3 further.

4 MR. GRUBER: Definitely want to explore.

5 MR. VARGULICH: There was a comment in the
6 staff report from the fire department related to
7 not having some of your on-street or on-driveway
8 parking that was going to parallel. Are you
9 opposed to that.

10 MR. HURST: I think it's important to
11 maintain as much parking as the turning radiuses
12 will allow for the emergency service vehicles to
13 access it, but if we end up needing to remove a
14 spot at the western or eastern boundary of that
15 cul-de-sac in order to facilitate that, that's
16 something to explore. It's 28 feet wide curb to
17 curb which is standard city street width all the
18 way around. So turning that into one way will not
19 necessarily widen it. It will give us a little
20 bit of different geometry how we can approach
21 those corners and stuff to create the access that
22 they need.

23 MR. VARGULICH: I have a question for
24 Ellen.

1 The parcel that the city owns on the north
2 side, what is the purpose of that currently?

3 MS. JOHNSON: We believe that it is in
4 order to provide access to the city parcels to the
5 west of this property. It's a potential future
6 city well site. White Bridge Drive is a private
7 road.

8 MR. VARGULICH: It looks like it's 50 or
9 60 feet wide so I was just curious why the city
10 would own that.

11 MR. HURST: There is also a sanitary
12 easement there, isn't there?

13 MS. JOHNSON: I believe so.

14 MR. EWOLDT: You'd mentioned about
15 infrastructure on this property. What is the
16 uniqueness I guess for the infrastructure.

17 MR. HURST: Probably the biggest things is
18 this site does not have water and the closest
19 viable connection to a water main is Abbeygate
20 {sic} and 31 so it's about a thousand linear
21 feature of water main that needs to be run just to
22 service the community.

23 MR. VARGULICH: Is there any reason that
24 can't come from the west up the drainage way where

1 there's a sanitary line that runs through there
2 now? It's still an effort but you would save all
3 the MOT and all that kind of stuff on 31.

4 MR. HURST: To be honest with you, that is
5 probably more a question for Public Works. I am
6 reacting to a water study that they commissioned
7 that kind of dictated based on their calculations
8 of flow rates and capacity where that water needed
9 to come from.

10 MR. VARGULICH: Okay. I don't know that
11 would be a lot shorter because we would just come
12 further from the west from Abbeywood -- so if you
13 came started further to the west on Abbeywood and
14 connected there and came up through the drainage
15 way into the western side of the property, that
16 would he just seem like, again, it may not save a
17 whole lot of linear footage but it would be an
18 easier construct from the standpoint of not having
19 to deal with Route 31 which obviously complicates
20 a lot of things.

21 MR. HURST: The city actually owns -- I
22 don't know if they own it or if there is an
23 easement but they have future plan for the path
24 for that water main from that connection point to

1 this site so there's no actual water main in the
2 ground, but there's a land plan for it that would
3 keep it modified that way.

4 MS. WIESE: In your estimation, then, is
5 this the crux of why there has been no development
6 or do we know?

7 MR. HURST: I would prefer not to
8 speculate on why previous developments haven't
9 gone forward. I do not know the answer to that.
10 Staff may be able to provide more insight, but for
11 us this is what we see as a feasible project based
12 on the infrastructure of the site.

13 MR. VARGULICH: Just on the water, is it
14 just going into your property or does it connect
15 to create more of a loop with other things.

16 MR. HURST: It does create a loop. And
17 the city has easements in place for all of that
18 which is probably how they picked the route that
19 they picked.

20 MR. VARGULICH: Thank you.

21 MS. MOAD: I have a question for staff.
22 Your comments indicated that larger vehicles will
23 over hang the street based on the driveway length.

24 How large of a vehicle would that have to

1 be?

2 MS. JOHNSON: Typically I would prefer we
3 have a 20-foot length driveway, 18 feet minimum I
4 believe. It's 16 feet. So it would be preferred
5 if two vehicles would be able to park in each
6 driveway as well as the vehicles inside the
7 garages to minimize parking needed on the private
8 drive because there is no parking on Route 31 so
9 it would be preferred to accommodate those
10 vehicles on driveway.

11 MS. MOAD: Are you assuming a vehicle back
12 to back or side by side?

13 MS. JOHNSON: Side by side.

14 MR. HURST: If I could just address that
15 question, right? This is kind of separate. It's
16 a very preliminary site plan. We obviously have a
17 lot of work, there is some math that we need to
18 refine as we go through the process, turning
19 radiuses and what have you, but there is an
20 opportunity with that street being 28 feet wide if
21 we reduce that to a one lane and a turning
22 radiuses still work, we could steal that foot
23 and-a-half we need out of that road and still
24 accommodate emergency vehicles, one way traffic

1 and 20-foot driveway.

2 MR. EWOLDT: Just out of curiosity, your
3 proposing to rezone this if you move forward from
4 single family to higher density for townhomes.

5 From your perspective, it's only, what,
6 two and-a-half acres, how do you feel that this
7 parcel is consistent with the goals to rezone it I
8 guess from the single family aspect.

9 MR. HURST: I think that this is a good
10 kind of microcosm of modern community planning,
11 any modern community that is being built today,
12 you will see multiple product types directly
13 adjacent to each other, whether it's a duplex or
14 single family detached residence, they are all
15 found within the same community. It's part of
16 creating a diverse housing stock and offering a
17 product line that will appeal to wide demographic
18 of people.

19 MR. EWOLDT: I have nothing wrong with
20 townhomes. I like the plan itself. I'm
21 struggling with the location just so you're aware.
22 In the context of the surrounding -- again, I like
23 the plan itself. It's just the context of the
24 area ask where I personally struggle.

1 I do have one question for staff. I guess
2 with the provision of water is services from a
3 single family perspective, does the city code
4 require to connect to services even with a single
5 family development? Like if it is zoned single
6 family the water mains are far away, does the code
7 still require he them to extend that water main?

8 MS. JOHNSON: Yes, yes, the water main
9 extension would be required regardless of housing
10 type.

11 MR. VARGULICH: Any other questions?
12 We'll hear what the public comment has to say, but
13 we may have more questions for you or other people
14 from your team.

15 We will open up for public comment and
16 we'll take one person at a time. Sir. Here.
17 Please come to the lectern.

18 MR. ERION: Hello everyone. Thank you for
19 taking the time to meet with us today. My is Matt
20 Erion. I live at 3102 Easton Place. I am the one
21 that would be most negatively affected by any more
22 property growth in terms of a drainage aspect.

23 I currently have flooding in my backyard
24 when it rains heavily. I've had the city out in

1 2020 and the city engineers to come look at it.
2 Basically the water comes to 30 feet within my
3 house, 30 feet of my house when it rains heavily
4 including my neighbors as well.

5 So I would like to address some of
6 inconsistencies or some things regarding the
7 comprehensive plan as well as the staff report.

8 So according to the city's comprehensive
9 plan, the detached single family homes are the
10 most common type of residential use in St.

11 Charles --

12 THE REPORTER: Sorry, sir. Can you please
13 slow down.

14 MR. VARGULICH: Take your time.

15 MR. ERION: Although this is most often
16 the desirable use for the area, the city should
17 ensure housing options continue to serve the
18 diverse population of St. Charles community and in
19 particular development that meets the specific
20 need of elderly residents ranging for multi-family
21 units to independent living which should be
22 encouraged to allow residents to age in place.
23 This is from the city's comprehensive plan, okay.

24 The target group according to the

1 application that was submitted is 25 to 34 years
2 old. Another go around that is the projected
3 amount of children in that development is 6 so you
4 have 25 to 34-year-olds and only six kids. That
5 map doesn't work for me.

6 Also the city -- the school district just
7 spent a lot of money to do a study on population,
8 school populations, Wild Rose would be feeder
9 school for elementary for this development. Wild
10 Rose is currently overpopulated. So that really
11 doesn't really fit along with other things, but
12 that does not fit in terms of how we're trying to
13 manage our school district.

14 So an important objective of the plan is
15 to continue to protect and enhance the city's
16 single family residential neighborhoods. Future
17 development should be respectful and sensitive to
18 the existing homes while allowing reinvestment in
19 the form of rehabilitation and issues in
20 construction in the existing neighborhoods.

21 Wherever possible, single family
22 neighborhoods should be buffered protected from
23 invasive incompatible uses. So directly -- some
24 of these folks have are going to have a 35-foot

1 distance from the back of their property to the
2 back of the house. That to me does not seem like
3 a buffer protected by any means in my opinion.
4 And just regular vegetation screening would not be
5 stuff.

6 Now I went over the start report Part 4-b
7 proposed use, I this was addressed already. The
8 user intended owner occupied. Intent is one
9 thing. What happens after that is another.
10 You're located right by St. Charles North which is
11 a very good school and it would be very simple for
12 someone to purchase that property, rent it out or
13 have their own children, have 12 kids in there
14 registered to live at the address to go to all
15 these good schools and that's not the intention of
16 how these neighborhoods were set up. This is not
17 what it is supposed to be.

18 In staff report 4-c, this was addressed,
19 longer vehicles in the driveways, staff report 4-d
20 it says we will reduce the driveway length. Well,
21 it's also in the application stated there's
22 supposed to be a significant central park, well
23 you start subtracting all of the -- make longer
24 driveways and significant central park is going to

1 become a lot less significant.

2 As was discussed, the traffic study would
3 be requested. I would highly encourage that you
4 all consider that to be done because the Route 31
5 traffic, the school right there with kids driving
6 back and forth like crazy you're trying to get all
7 these people to work and home and back out of this
8 one entrance on to Route 31, that's going to be a
9 disaster. There is going to be all sorts of
10 accidents. So, again, I highly, highly encourage
11 you all to really ask for that study to be done
12 because I think most people here would agree it's
13 not safe.

14 Staff review 6a, engineering review,
15 engineering staff conducted a preliminary review.
16 It appears that the size of the storm water
17 management area on the west side of the property
18 is not sufficient. I can tell you first hand it
19 is not. Additional, land area will be needed.
20 Here is the key, okay, the land to the west is
21 owned by the city and shall not be used as storm
22 water management for development. All right.
23 This is right out of your staff report.
24 Engineering plans storm water report as well as

1 wetland assessment will be required. Okay, that's
2 great. Engineering already said it wasn't
3 sufficient. What are we doing here?

4 So to complicate this even more, it's part
5 of the application for this -- this is from their
6 application, okay to the west there is existing
7 storm water management basin that provides a
8 buffer to city owned land currently being used for
9 storm water management and open space. This basin
10 will be evaluated and improved by who? To
11 accommodate and exceed form water management needs
12 of the community. Well, it was just stated the
13 development cannot use that city land west of this
14 planned development so there is a big problem. I
15 would argue that the drainage is probably a more
16 expensive issue than the water main. The water
17 main is only 210 feet long. I would say the
18 required amount of work to get this drainage fixed
19 properly is well more than that.

20 So staff report Section 8, suggested
21 action, land use and compatibility with
22 surrounding development. Clearly not, clearly
23 not. So, again, 42 adults, 21 units and only five
24 or six kids? All these people driving in and out

1 of there? That's going to be a disaster.

2 So those are my comments for today.

3 Thank you for listening to me. I appreciate it

4 (Applause).

5 MR. VARGULICH: I would just offer a

6 couple of comments.

7 The number of children that you're

8 identifying is a standard type of equation that's

9 done based on land uses and based on history

10 across a broad area of the Chicago metro area and

11 not just St. Charles. And so that's where those

12 kind of factors come from. It's approved by the

13 school district as something that they accept as

14 far as the projections. So it's something that

15 the city I believe has just adopted as part of

16 their review process, but the city doesn't

17 generate -- create that form to generate those

18 numbers. So as long as the number of units and

19 the unit type and the bedroom unit those are the

20 numbers that are generated. Not to say that those

21 things are a hundred percent right all the time.

22 MR. ERION: No, I don't think you guys

23 considered 25 to 34 years old, but I mean...

24 MR. VARGULICH: That is part of how those

1 numbers --

2 On the storm water management, I believe
3 that while it's preliminary commentary by the
4 city's engineering department, every project in
5 St. Charles has to adhere to every aspect of
6 drainage requirements. A basin is only one
7 aspect. They've indicated and we could ask of
8 them to use BMPs which are different ways to
9 manage storm water management as a way to get to
10 the total number of cubic feet of water that needs
11 to be stored.

12 So I don't think there's any project and
13 I'm sure Monica or other people from the
14 engineering department would agree that there is
15 no project in St. Charles that gets passed on the
16 requirements for storm water management.

17 So, again, all of that -- for them to move
18 forward, they would have to provide an extensive
19 amount of calculations and prove up their pond
20 size as well as any other factors that they were
21 using to address what the requirements are.

22 MR. ERION: Well, the pond size is
23 currently in my backyard.

24 MR. VARGULICH: Anyone else?

1 MR. SCHOENING: It looks like a lot of
2 pages here. I feel like I'm in front of a
3 Congress subcommittee. You people are way too
4 nice to be in Congress.

5 MR. VARGULICH: Thank you.

6 MR. SCHOENING: My name is Ken Schoening,
7 3103 Pendleton Ct. We are adjacent to the
8 property there. I know -- I have know Mr. Karsch
9 when he was there. We've been there for 26 years
10 now. Our property is right on the corner. A
11 little history maybe. I don't know how many of
12 you have been here in 2005 when they approved the
13 four lots, were any of you here?

14 MR. VARGULICH: Not on the Plan
15 Commission.

16 MR. SCHOENING: That's fine. One of the
17 reasons, I think you brought it up somebody
18 brought it up any way, why is there city owned
19 property back there? That's the backup well for
20 the city so they have a right of passage whatever
21 you call it back there so that they can get to the
22 well in case they ever need that backup well. I
23 used to hold soccer practice out there. Hope you
24 don't mind. Anyway, so one of the reasons,

1 someone else asked this question, why has nothing
2 ever been built back there. We went through this
3 in 2005 and I spoke in front of the planning
4 commission then and one of the issues they were
5 looking at then I think you brought it up they had
6 four homes approved back there and two and-a-half
7 acre lot and because of the size of the cul de sac
8 the one facing our property was going to be --
9 their back door was ten feet off our property line
10 but that really -- although that was an issue for
11 us, I don't know if that was the major issue, but
12 the city turned them down and one of the reasons
13 was is because it's a low land back there and it's
14 constantly flooding and we talked about this in
15 the planning commission and one of the things they
16 did is they had the SBC engineers which did a
17 great job, came out when we had a massive rainfall
18 and said, oh, you're right, all the properties
19 over on Easton Court they flood dramatically when
20 there is heavy rains and so that was one of the
21 issues that came up is how are we going to get by
22 with that. It's one of the things that came up is
23 if you're going to build on that property, we're
24 going to have to raise it up substantially, which

1 I know the city code is 35 feet, but now they have
2 to raise this up five to ten feet to get anything
3 back there, now you're talking 45 feet.

4 The other thing was if they were going to
5 drain that property properly, they were going to
6 have to tear out the bridge underneath Abbeywood
7 and drain it down quicker downstream and they were
8 going to have to tear out the bridge on Greenwood
9 Lane and tear that one out and redo everything.
10 We can't just keep pumping water into the backyard
11 as Matt said.

12 I don't know how you get by some of that
13 without substantial rerouting. I know Craig
14 Falkenthal who runs the Mercedes dealership was
15 saying he actually talked to the Army Corps of
16 Engineers that actually did the study and how to
17 get the water to flow down. If they are we are
18 going to change things, there is a bunch of things
19 downstream that need to change.

20 I talked about the backup well, the
21 buildings. So I guess my question to the
22 commission and, again, I appreciate everything
23 you're doing and thank you for your time today,
24 but if it wasn't big enough for four homes, how

1 are you going to put 21 there? It just seems like
2 we're trying to squeeze things in and this whole
3 property, this whole community at least up in that
4 area was all zoned single family. When we bought
5 into there, everyone assumed, hey, it's going to
6 be single family. I knew when I moved in there
7 that Sebastian had an issue with collecting junk,
8 but I asked that question. If they take him out
9 of there some day, is this going to be single
10 family? They said, yeah, it's always going to be
11 single family, and that's what it's zoned. And
12 eventually they took all his stuff out of there.
13 There is still some stuff out there, but the house
14 came down and everything else.

15 One side note to that, he was a great
16 neighbor. I was out cutting branches one day and
17 went in to eat lunch and all the branches were
18 gone and he put them all on his property piled him
19 up. Some days I wish he was back.

20 So, again, the same thing Matt said and
21 some of this is I just don't think it fits the
22 neighborhood. A couple of the neighbors, there is
23 one with us that is adjacent, the other one is an
24 elderly couple, they can't make it tonight, they

1 have some issues of transportation. So I do have
2 some signed documents from them so we could hand
3 them into I don't know who collects that stuff.

4 MR. VARGULICH: Staff.

5 MR. SCHOENING: I'll give them to you
6 after the meeting and I thank you for your time
7 and listening to us today, again, I think you can
8 see by the group here and there is a lot out of
9 town right now, there is several people on Easton
10 Court that couldn't make it, so I'm hopefully
11 representing them, but it just doesn't fit the
12 neighborhood.

13 MR. VARGULICH: Thank you.

14 (Applause).

15 MR. VARGULICH: Anyone else?

16 MS. PATTEN-NAWARA: Hi. My name is Beth
17 Patten-Nawara. I live at 3101 Pendleton Court and
18 I agree with what Matt and Ken have said and I am
19 just going to add it was said earlier that it is
20 believed that the pedestrian path improves
21 connectivity to the city. It is a path that leads
22 to nowhere. It's a path that leads to a road that
23 leads to a road that leads to a road that leads to
24 a bike path that leads to a road. It doesn't add

1 anybody any closer to the city any easier.

2 (Applause).

3 MR. VARGULICH: Sir?

4 MR. HEWELL: Hello. I'm Todd Hewell. My
5 address is 36W475 Hunters Gate Road. Lived in St.
6 Charles for 36 years, been adjacent to that
7 property, I would say adjacent but in the
8 surrounding area since 1996.

9 I echo the comments of the other neighbors
10 that came up especially that last point about the
11 access to the road. I think what this development
12 is a very nice, but it's not for the right -- I
13 would think this type of development would be well
14 suited for like Charlestowne Mall or another lot
15 that handles that density, but to rezone this from
16 single family to higher density I think is a big
17 mistake.

18 I think a lot of the issues with this like
19 the gentleman mentioned before about drainage and
20 infrastructure, I mean, honestly this is more of a
21 township problem than I would think the City of
22 St. Charles.

23 I would also have a lot of concerns even
24 in the wintertime with snow removal. I don't see

1 how this plan has adequate area for even piling
2 all the snow.

3 A study also for the traffic. I think if
4 you had 96 vehicles that are going to be on that
5 lot, like others had mentioned, you're going to
6 have a lot of accidents and issues. I'm not sure
7 if they could restrict turning north out of there
8 on 31, but I would think that would be a minimum
9 that you would want to consider.

10 Also consider that there is a walking path
11 on the development land, but there is no sidewalks
12 so you're essentially like the lady before
13 mentioned you're really creating an island for
14 people for really for them to have nowhere to go.

15 I also think it's a concern the gentleman
16 mentioned, too, about building units for people of
17 all ages. These all have to be entered on the
18 ground floor and use stairs to go up. That would
19 be one concern.

20 And I think I've gotten all of my items.
21 I would say I'm a little bit mixed with the trail
22 because I think connecting the trail to Red Gate
23 neighborhood would be a benefit, but it's not
24 really much of a benefit because as the lady

1 mentioned, it doesn't really go too far, but I
2 would think that would have to be part of the
3 requirement if this were to go through because
4 there is no sidewalks along 31. You're creating a
5 big risk for people turning in and out of there.

6 So I think this plan, again, would be
7 great but not for this lot and I would not
8 recommend that this gets rezoned. Thank you very
9 much.

10 (Applause).

11 MR. VARGULICH: Sir.

12 MR. STAVROPOULOS: Hi, how are you doing.
13 Along with some of the others that spoke with me
14 they came prepared, I just wanted to share --

15 MR. VARGULICH: I'm sorry, sir, if you
16 could give us your name.

17 MR. STAVROPOULOS: Nick Stavropoulos.
18 3103 Easton Place. I'm a neighbor of Matt's.

19 I also shared concern regarding drainage
20 on properties. Prior to this in this meeting
21 today, I didn't realize that it wasn't isolated.
22 I thought it was just my challenge. I've
23 contacted the city on numerous occasions. I
24 brought the property back in 2016, '17 time frame

1 single family and bought it and it was probably
2 sold intentionally that way, but I very quickly
3 realized I had a drainage issue and had the city
4 out a number of times and have worked with
5 engineers trying to resolve the issue
6 unsuccessfully.

7 So similar to Matt, I also am impacted by
8 that. I have lived in St. Charles since 2000. I
9 moved out from Davis, Richmond area which is
10 another whole chapter that I'd like to forget.
11 Let's not create another mess. I would ask that
12 the city look into fixing the drainage issues for
13 the residents and taxpayers like myself that it is
14 impacting our quality of life because it's a
15 concept fight for us even when there's not a
16 storm. I'm concerned -- I have spent a lot of
17 time on that property because it is fairly unkempt
18 but its a swampy area and so this is going to
19 negatively affect a problem that exists today
20 that's not been fixed by the city.

21 So any plan that moves forward to take
22 away land that's almost acting like a retention
23 pond unofficially, you need to do some research
24 and studies how that's going to impact us because

1 we already have current drainage issues that are
2 not being addressed by the city. And I was told
3 by the city it's at the time it's not their
4 problem to fix, but with the number of residents
5 that are impacted by it, I think it's critical
6 that the city take a look at that and consider
7 that.

8 Secondly, part of the reason why I'm moved
9 in the area is and people have talked about it but
10 there is something unique about the property.
11 There is a lot of wildlife. In the wintertime or
12 spring, there is eight or ten deer in my backyard.
13 Now, we love that part of the neighborhood. I
14 lived in the downtown area, didn't that have that
15 experience. I have got close to an acre of
16 property. I come home after a hard day of work
17 and I see deer just grazing in my backyard. It's
18 the most beautiful thing.

19 This area, in this wooded area is where
20 they reside. That's something that we need to
21 consider. Nobody has talked about the impact of
22 wildlife and using this property differently. I
23 got to imagine this property hasn't been developed
24 in 20 years. It's available on the cheap. I look

1 at St. Charles, the city, to look at utilizing
2 this property differently and using it as a
3 wildlife refuge and better retention area for us
4 that are impacted by the drainage issues.

5 And then the last thing I'll say is I've
6 got two kids. One is in college now. I was
7 deathly afraid of her driving on Route 31. She
8 lost a good friend of hers in a car accident. On
9 Route 31 during the school day it's almost a
10 disaster to get through. I am overprotective of
11 my kids like everyone else but when they leave the
12 high school, it's a disaster to travel on Route 31
13 and to exit out of Abbeywood with 31 traffic is
14 already dangerous. We are talking about
15 introducing two cars per unit, another 40 cars
16 that kids are going to have to navigate.

17 So between the drainage issue that's
18 current and this property, I wasn't around in 2005
19 in this particular area, but I can assure you that
20 this didn't move forward because of drainage
21 issues. So any plan to move forward needs to
22 address drainage and make sure we get relieved as
23 part of that process. Secondly, I think the
24 wildlife and preservation of that needs to be

1 considered and then safety, the traffic must be
2 considered because we can't afford to lose more
3 kids because of selfishness and what is clearly an
4 opportunity to generate money by the developer
5 that has built several properties in St. Charles.
6 Let's not make this mistake.

7 MS. TROOST: Hi. My name is Dawn Troost,
8 T-r-o-o-s-t. I live at 5N076 White Bridge Road,
9 and I'm also here on behalf of my elderly
10 neighbors. They live at 5N068 and they asked that
11 I speak on their behalf also.

12 So my concern is that right now you're
13 allowed 2.4 units per acre and I believe they said
14 this would increase it to 8.8 units per acre which
15 is a third so that's land coverage of 38 percent.
16 I don't believe, you can correct me if I'm wrong,
17 but does that include the pavement because if
18 you're including that too the development of that
19 land it's going to be much greater than that and
20 our road is a gravel road. So I know myself and
21 my neighbors we're concerned about water runoff
22 because there are water issues and I see some of
23 my neighbors here all of us have water issues.
24 There's just too much water. None of us so far

1 have made our water issues other people's water
2 issues. We deal with it on our land. We take
3 care of it. We don't turn it into another
4 person's problem, and when you're developing a
5 site and putting that much pavement, that much
6 development on the land, there is not a lot of
7 room for the water to soak into the ground. There
8 just isn't. That's why you pave parking lots, you
9 have water issues.

10 So I understand that this is part of the
11 plan but it's a real concern and we have standing
12 water when it's not -- the term storm water is not
13 really accurate because we have water issues
14 almost all the time. So we don't need a lot of
15 rain to have water issues. And we all do, we have
16 very old -- I have very old trees on my property,
17 a lot of my neighbors do. We try to maintain
18 those trees. A lot of them are old growth trees
19 and I know there was mention that there is an
20 ordinance, but if you develop is that land it
21 doesn't sound like maybe there is any say teeth to
22 the ordinance, I'm not sure, but if you develop
23 that land I don't see where any old growth trees
24 are going to be maintained because there are old

1 growth trees there. I walk that road, I drive
2 that road, and I can you there's also ponds on
3 that.

4 So one thing that I would just ask is for
5 you to consider is to consider this. If you
6 haven't gone and seen property, please go and see
7 it because I think you'll learn a lot from seeing
8 it and our concerns, and I understand some people
9 may not want to speculate. I'm going to go ahead
10 and speculate on why that land has not been
11 developed. It's going to cost a lot of money to
12 develop. There are ponds on it, there are tons of
13 trees so, yes, to make it feasible, to make it
14 profit, you're going to try to pack as much as you
15 can on it, but that's not what this land is for.
16 It's for houses, single houses. That's why we all
17 moved there. I understand if maybe you want to
18 put a couple of houses and try to deal with the
19 storm water, but I really think that this project
20 will be detrimental to almost everyone that lives
21 around it and I don't think that that's right. So
22 thank you.

23 (Applause).

24 MR. VARGULICH: Thank you. Anyone else?

1 MS. FOTOPOULOS: Hi. Alicia Fotopoulos.
2 F-o-t-o-p-o-u-l-o-s. I live at 35W945 Fieldcrest.

3 So this development is literally just
4 across, just south of me off of White Bridge. I
5 agree with what everyone has said so far I did
6 come up here to just further express the fact the
7 wildlife, that's a big concern for me because as
8 that gentleman said, waking up in the morning
9 having the deer in the yard, where are they going
10 to go? Where are the birds going to go? All the
11 green space, there are a ton of trees back there.
12 I would hate to see all these old trees go and in
13 addition to that pollution. You're now adding 21
14 additional houses that being built over time there
15 is going to be noise pollution with that, 40 plus
16 additional cars and it's more pollution. I am
17 very concerned about the environment.

18 I think it looks like a lovely concept,
19 just not right for that area. Thank you.

20 MR. MEZNARSIC: Debra M-e-z-n-a-r-s-i-c.

21 Where I see here --

22 MR. VARGULICH: I'm sorry. Your address
23 please.

24 MR. MEZNARSIC: 36W081 Field Crest Drive

1 St. Charles. I actually see two issues here.
2 St. Charles is in the process with the residents
3 trying to save our dam. Trying to save the Fox
4 River and I'm standing here being a naturalist
5 trying to save that lot also. I am concerned
6 about water. I'm concerned about light pollution.
7 I can stand in my backyard right now and look at
8 the stars and galaxies. I have neighbors who have
9 one house on an acre and some have one house on
10 two. We are in an unincorporated township.

11 I want to ask the individuals that are
12 building this is this going to be one story, two
13 story or three story complexes.

14 MR. HURST: Three stories.

15 MR. MEZNARSIC: That's what I was afraid
16 of. Three story, so the first floor is a
17 basement, the second floor is a living area and
18 the third floor is the bedroom area; is that
19 correct.

20 MR. HURST: Correct.

21 MR. MEZNARSIC: The center area is just
22 like the Geneva one, everybody with their garages
23 face the center and they look at asphalt, they
24 look at parking garages, and one gazebo. I live

1 in St. Charles. I have wonderful park district.
2 We care about our surroundings and I'm standing
3 here pleading with you as a committee not to take
4 something that was designed for one house, trying
5 to do a four house and not doing a township. I am
6 going to have light pollution coming into my
7 backyard. The individuals that are 250 feet away
8 they are going to have light pollution, they are
9 going to have noise pollution, they are going to
10 have people working on their cars. You are going
11 to have a city lifestyle that you have now moved
12 into a rural lifestyle and that's not why we're
13 paying our taxes and we are paying extremely high
14 taxes but we pay it because we treasure where we
15 live. Thank you.

16 (Applause).

17 MS. McWARD: Hello. I am going to make it
18 easy, Kat, K-a-t, McWard, M-c-W-a-r-d. First of
19 all we are at 5N117 Fox Buff Court, which directly
20 backs up to the vacant lot. It's an
21 unincorporated pocket of what I call a slice of
22 heaven. When my husband and I bought our home in
23 2018 actually at the closing table we were told
24 that our property line goes over White Bridge

1 Road. That means that when we see White Bridge
2 Road on all the renderings, our property actually
3 goes beyond there. So this would literally be in
4 our backyard. I like what she was talking about,
5 light pollution. I never even thought about that,
6 but I find myself thinking this is a home that my
7 husband and I bought as our retirement home. You
8 know, he doesn't want to move. I would have to
9 pry him out there, probably going to die there if
10 we can, right, but the thing is when we bought
11 this property, we've improved on it so much and we
12 put so much work into it and really making it to
13 our retirement home. And the reason we fell in
14 love with it is because of the lot that is sits on
15 and even though there was always a chance of
16 something being developed in the back of us, it
17 was always R-1 zoning, it was always going to be
18 residential. So even if someone put a house like
19 ours or two on the property, it wouldn't be -- I'm
20 going to say it -- an eyesore.

21 This is going to be an eyesore for those
22 people that have lived there for the sole purpose
23 of trying to preserve this type of aesthetic for
24 the neighborhood. It doesn't fit. I

1 understand -- I'm a real estate agent so I
2 understand about improving and mixing old with
3 new, but this is just weird. It's just a weird
4 development right in the middle of you've got Red
5 Gate which has very strict covenants and all these
6 things you cannot do. I believe on the one side
7 they can't even put up fences, and then you have
8 our development which is all unincorporated so
9 very sort of rural, and then your going to put
10 this and may I ask how tall these buildings are
11 going to be?

12 MR. HURST: 35 feet.

13 MS. McWARD: I think they are going to be
14 taller and 35 feet. Let's go with that.

15 I am going to walk out of my backyard
16 where I have my chickens and the hawks that are
17 always trying to get at them from that land, so
18 I'm going to walk out to my backyard and then I'm
19 going to look at a wall, a wall of townhomes.
20 And, like I said, from the real estate
21 perspective, from a realtor's perspective,
22 probably not very good for my home value or resale
23 because selling a home that backs up to an R-1
24 zoned property probably is worth a little more

1 than selling a home backed up to what they are
2 proposing to do on it.

3 I want to talk with water issues a little
4 bit. I think my husband Scott can talk to that a
5 little more. Any time it rains the water pools.
6 We've even talked about improving our lot in the
7 back because it gets so bad you can't even mow it.
8 You can't even drive the zero turn back there
9 because it will get stuck. There is a part of our
10 property between the two lots, ours and one next
11 to ours, that we can't even walk on for days after
12 it rains just because it gets so soggy with water.

13 So, I mean, the road is a little bit
14 higher, White Bridge Road is a little bit higher.
15 I've been on that vacant lot. I've taken my son
16 there many times just to look for deer tracks.
17 There is a creek that runs through it. So, once
18 again, this would be a very expensive undertaking
19 to improve that land, but I just I didn't want to
20 leave without making it known that the aesthetic,
21 it just doesn't fit. It just wouldn't fit.

22 So I'm asking you to please consider those
23 of us who have moved into this area because we
24 didn't want to be in a high density environment.

1 We wanted to be in a rural type of setting and
2 want to preserve that. Thank you.

3 (Applause).

4 MR. VARGULICH: Anyone else? Please,
5 your turn.

6 MR. KEUP: I just want to say that this
7 April was 40 years since I've been on Fieldcrest.
8 The quality of life in St. Charles is
9 unbelievable. I used to say that there was two
10 types of people, the people who live in St.
11 Charles and the people that want to live in St.
12 Charles. And I think the reason St. Charles is
13 such a great town is because there's been people
14 like you guys that have made great decisions and
15 just not sold the town out. And I've been here
16 for other reasons and I just think that I feel
17 very confident that I'm in good hands because you
18 guys will make the right decision.

19 Nice try, Frontier. Nice try. I know
20 you're trying to make a living, but, no. It's
21 just not suited. You can tell me how bent over I
22 am, I worked construction now for 45 years, I've
23 done excavating, and concrete I'm totally aware of
24 what construction is all about. I have done

1 residential in St. Charles, I have done commercial
2 all over the place. So I do understand
3 construction. And I certainly understand Frontier
4 wanting to make money. This is not fit for the
5 area. I'm not going to talk about the water. You
6 guys have heard enough about that. It's just not
7 fit for the area and the wildlife thing,
8 absolutely right. If you're going to look on a
9 map you see how the deer -- you are not going to
10 see deer in an area where they are -- they have
11 got plenty of room to run. They can go from that
12 area all the way almost to Wild Rose. They can
13 cross 31 and make it all the way to Wayne, and
14 that's why we have such wildlife, but, once again,
15 I certainly understand what these guys want to do,
16 but it doesn't fit and I'm not saying what they've
17 done -- you're looking it. It looks like a
18 campus.

19 Everybody in my subdivision lives on an
20 acre and-a-half or greater and it's very diverse
21 bunch of people and we welcome single family
22 stuff, but we certainly have no use for this.

23 Like I say Frontier, nice try, but not on
24 our shift.

1 (Applause).

2 MS. VAN ROEKEL: Hi. I'm Abby Van Roekel.
3 I live at 205 Abbeywood Drive.

4 MR. VARGULICH: If you could spell your
5 name for our court reporter.

6 MS. VAN ROEKEL: V-a-n R-o-e-k-e-l.

7 I think all of my colleagues have said
8 very well all of my arguments. I just have a
9 couple of things to add.

10 No. 1, Tom Wolfe said you can't go home
11 again. So if you change the zoning from the way
12 it is now to more dense zoning, there is no going
13 back and we really, really don't want a higher
14 density of living when everything else around us
15 is the same as we are now. It just as the
16 gentleman before said it doesn't fit.

17 And the second thing is you all represent
18 people in the city. You represent people now who
19 pay taxes now and fund the city now and the
20 majority of us are saying no, do not change the
21 zoning. So please listen to us. The majority.
22 Thank you.

23 (Applause).

24 MR. VARGULICH: Anyone else? Please.

1 MR. VAN ROEKEL: That's a tough act to
2 follow. That's my wife. I live at 205 Abbeywood
3 Drive and I want to be very short. We are the
4 first ones that lived in Red Gate at 205. When we
5 moved in there were no trees, the city had planted
6 no trees. The drives were all still gravel and we
7 still had a water problem at that time. The field
8 around us were exactly that. You can see where
9 the last harvest of corn was still laying on the
10 ground.

11 That being the case, there was a lot of
12 land available for water absorption and there was
13 still a water problem.

14 So just to verify historically everything
15 that's been said, if you move forward on this will
16 only exacerbate the water problem. Thank you.

17 (Applause).

18 MR. VARGULICH: Please.

19 MR. HUYNH: I'm Nghi Huynh. N-g-h-i
20 H-u-y-n-h. I live at 206 Abbeywood. I have a
21 video of how everyone talks about, the water in my
22 backyard and I recorded here. So actually my son
23 is in the window. We can see the deer. The
24 reason because I love that part of St. Charles and

1 I do not want to see any big tall buildings in our
2 community and I really want to urge the committee
3 every time we have anything big in the future,
4 please let everyone in Red Gate know so we can
5 talk about it. Right now there is only a few
6 people in the community know and the rest of them
7 they don't. So really think important to inform
8 everyone before we make any decision.

9 MR. VARGULICH: Okay. Thank you.

10 (Applause).

11 MR. VARGULICH: I would just like to offer
12 tonight is only the beginning of this process if
13 you will, and so if the applicant decides to move
14 forward after they have a similar meeting with
15 planning and development committee next week, then
16 there will be further notices, website, property
17 owners week. There will be a public hearing. The
18 property owner notification is 250 feet from the
19 subject property. So, that's the statute and if
20 would like to -- you have to address this with
21 staff as far as requesting any additional
22 notifications, but the statute is 250 feet from
23 the subject property.

24 But there will be more chances for people

1 to speak if the project comes forward. So this
2 isn't the end so just -- and I appreciate
3 everybody's comments and your passion about how
4 you feel and just for clarity and, believe me, I'm
5 not passing the buck at all but this body is a
6 recommending body to City Council. We deliberate
7 over these issues and we will offer an opinion and
8 a recommendation on this project.

9 Tonight is just informational, but if they
10 file a formal application, we will do the same but
11 we recommend to City Council. So City Council is
12 the final decisionmaker, but we hope that they
13 take our thoughts and recommendations into
14 consideration.

15 So please come and share with us but then
16 you'll also have to also share with City Council.
17 And certainly writing as people have already done
18 like a petition or an e-mail or a letter and
19 sharing with our planning staff will all become
20 part of the packet of public record which I know
21 all of our elected officials spend time looking
22 over and deliberating over and hearing what people
23 have to say, but, again, attendance here is the
24 beginning so thank you.

1 Anyone else before we bring it back to the
2 planning commission? Anyone else tonight?

3 MR. SCHOENING: I just wanted to say thank
4 you for having us all here tonight and listening
5 to us. I know these things aren't always easy
6 because there is a lot of emotions built up and
7 the folks that are owners here in St. Charles
8 thanks for all you do with the community and I
9 just want to thank you for doing this. It makes
10 us all feel a little bit better.

11 MR. HEWELL: I just had a clarifying
12 question because the one lady mentioned about how
13 high the elevation is, but my understanding is
14 there is no below grade space in the townhome; is
15 that correct.

16 MR. HURST: Correct.

17 MR. HEWELL: My concern with that would be
18 we are in tornado alley. I think that's also
19 indicative, too, of the drainage issues that
20 people in that area it's pretty common for
21 everyone to have basements. That would also be a
22 concern of mine is you're jamming a lot of people
23 in there that really don't have I would say an
24 adequate safe area of refuge. Thank you.

1 (Applause).

2 MR. VARGULICH: Thank you. Again, unless
3 there is somebody else, I'm not trying to cut
4 anybody off, I think we'll bring it back to our
5 planning commission members and we would offer
6 some final feedback after hearing the presentation
7 and also public comment on this project.

8 We will provide some feedback hopefully on
9 these topics, land use, compatibility with
10 surrounding development, the proposed zoning
11 itself, site layout, connectivity and building
12 design.

13 So we can all start wherever you want and
14 go from one end to the other.

15 MR. FITZGERALD: I certainly think that
16 the water issue is very, very relevant. I have
17 been on that property many times with our son and
18 gone home quite wet when it has rained a lot. The
19 property itself certainly is beautiful, but I
20 think water should certainly be addressed.

21 No. 2 moving an established residential
22 area whether its RE-1 or RM is quite honestly
23 problematic. If it's planned at the beginning
24 with that then you can look at Wild Rose Springs,

1 Timbers, Wildwood Cove, those are all planning
2 from the outside to have multi-family with single
3 family and to change the dynamic of that at this
4 point 35 years in, I'm just looking at the city
5 side, so no offense to anybody in township, I'm
6 just looking City of St. Charles standpoint, I
7 don't think that's a proper direction for this
8 parcel.

9 MS. WIESE: Looking at this and hearing
10 everyone now as well read about the water issue.
11 I e-mailed staff because I wanted to find out if
12 this moved forward, then it's on the developers,
13 they have to I want to make sure I get this
14 correct, they have to offer a storm water report
15 and engineering plans. So the one thing I will
16 say is that which doing that it may perhaps lead
17 to an answer as to what is the water problem.
18 That may get discovered; it may also prove that
19 it's not viable. It may prove that it is, but it
20 will require more information just as we've noted
21 this is just the beginning.

22 So I'm pleased to hear that based on what
23 we're seeing, there is no definitive answer at
24 this moment on what the impact of this unit will

1 do to the water issue. We don't know that now.
2 There is much more that needs to be done. So I
3 just want it make sure everyone knows that and
4 staff address that with me that there is much more
5 that has to come. So I just want to make sure
6 everyone knows at this level that that's what we
7 are working with.

8 That actually gave me a little bit of
9 heart because I thought I maybe it will actually
10 get to the bottom of what is going on with this
11 property, the adjacent properties and how it's
12 affecting everything. That's my first take on it.

13 The second thing I'll say is I also lived
14 in an area that had a change, had some higher
15 density coming into it that didn't fit within the
16 scope of the neighborhood. The impact -- and this
17 was before I was ever on planning commission, the
18 impact wasn't as significant as it may seem to be.
19 That's not to say -- I would absolutely think that
20 there needs to be an IDOT study. I would
21 recommend that. I think that would be important.
22 I think 31 is a challenging road but its
23 controlled by IDOT so I think that's important and
24 I would recommend that.

1 Change is hard. That's not to say what
2 the impact will be, but I don't think it's a bad
3 thing to investigate this and see what is
4 happening on this property at the very least
5 because all the costs that everyone is talking
6 about are going to be incurred by the developer,
7 they are not going to be incurred by the
8 residents. So that's kind of where I stand right
9 now. It seems there is something going on here
10 but if by chance this property could improve
11 things, I think that needs to be weighed into. I
12 don't know that it will or it won't. But I don't
13 think anyone can actually say right now and that's
14 what I want to know. I want to see what happens
15 with the engineering reviews.

16 MR. GRUBER: I'd like to thank Frontier
17 for their presentation. It's always great to have
18 people that want to invest in our community and
19 that's a great thing. That's why we all live
20 here. We all care for our community.

21 I appreciate the comments and professional
22 decorum with which they were brought out. There
23 were fantastic points and that's also a great
24 thing about our community.

1 For someone that lives off of 31, I get
2 many of your concerns. The gentleman, forgive me,
3 I didn't write your name, I tried to keep up with
4 the court reporter but she is better than I am. I
5 have four kids that cross -- learned how to drive
6 on 31, one who got in an accident on 31. So I
7 would definitely want to have a traffic study done
8 as it relates to the impact of traffic and
9 definitely it would help us with getting in and
10 out of that community because I think it would
11 change some impact on the 31 traffic. And you
12 have to consider schools. So I would want that to
13 be part of any recommendation going forward.

14 MR. ROSENBERG: I just want to say even if
15 we do a traffic study, there is no way to change
16 the fact there is going to be an increased traffic
17 on Route 31. Even if you put a traffic light
18 there and there was a right turn, it's still going
19 to create more danger. I have young kids as well.
20 So that's one take of mine.

21 The other that I didn't really think about
22 until people spoke was the noise issue and the
23 light pollution. I think that part of this
24 commission is always looking to move forward with

1 the city's comprehensive plan, but I think equally
2 we need to represent fellow residents. Even
3 though there is a traffic study, it just seems out
4 of context. That's just my opinion.

5 MS. MOAD: I would like to first thank
6 everyone here for all of your comments. They
7 certainly are important to us and thank Frontier
8 for bringing this to us.

9 I'm going start by saying I think the
10 development itself is well thought out. I like
11 the fact that the entrances to the residences in
12 the garages face inward so they don't encroach on
13 the neighbors and the outward facing facade of the
14 buildings is what the neighbors would be looking
15 at which is the front of the building versus the
16 back of the buildings. I appreciate that. I
17 think it's thoughtful and I like the design of the
18 buildings.

19 I do think that listening to the group
20 today brings forward a very significant concern
21 and I would ask that Frontier do a comprehensive
22 study almost before we move forward with this
23 project and a traffic study also be done. I
24 happen to live in a development downtown in the

1 brownstones so I'm not opposed to mixed use and I
2 think that a community can be very adaptable to
3 any -- it is dependent on homeowners association
4 and how the covenants were developed. I think in
5 any community where we don't allow renters, so
6 that can be written into the covenants, for
7 example, of a townhome development and there has
8 never been a rental in my development. We are all
9 owners. So we take a lot of pride in it.

10 So I'm not opposed to pursuing the
11 possibility in particular because road private,
12 it's off of 31. It should not increase traffic
13 into the neighborhoods. We do need to understand
14 the impact on Route 31.

15 MR. EWOLDT: So as I stated before from a
16 townhome perspective design standpoint, I like the
17 design, just not the context of the location. I
18 think it's incompatible with the surrounding
19 properties and the lot sizes.

20 I actually feel it's getting close to spot
21 zoning to what you're proposing. After listening
22 to everybody, I think I would rather see sidewalks
23 put in front and then a connection down 31 rather
24 than the potential of the path going through the

1 city property. I think there is an opportunity
2 for the state or the city's connect down to
3 Abbeywood. That's something I would like to see,
4 but connectivity from early on or right off the
5 bat from any property expect to have a new
6 development install sidewalks and we can work on
7 connecting those into the future but from a
8 contact standpoint, I do feel that the
9 neighborhood the residents have come out have
10 valid claims and comments and I also appreciate
11 them coming out tonight and stating their
12 opinions.

13 MR. VARGULICH: I would offer a few
14 thoughts. And I did go to the property the other
15 day, didn't stay long, only because I was short on
16 time, but I did want to go see the property
17 because I think it's always valuable to assess not
18 the only the site plan but the surrounding area
19 and how this potential project could integrate
20 with it if that's possible.

21 Clearly the surrounding neighbors as a
22 group you don't care for this dense of a project.
23 I think that there is fairness in our
24 comprehensive plan to suggest that multi-family

1 projects can compatible with adjacent single
2 family properties, but I do think that it's
3 important to also assess a comment that's in the
4 comprehensive plan and should be in our ordinances
5 with respect to creating appropriate landscape
6 buffers between those uses to address the density
7 differences. And so I think that the tree
8 preservation plan or tree assessment plan will be
9 an important one to look at.

10 Clearly from a site planning standpoint
11 the center of the site is really going to kind of
12 be lost from a tree standpoint unless a tree or
13 two or however many end up in the center grade, if
14 you will, as proposed if that happens, but then
15 there's also issues of how utilities are
16 installed, whether they are in the pavement,
17 whether they are in the green areas and whether
18 those trees would be able to survive the various
19 grade changes that happen over time.

20 Tree survival is a condition not only of
21 root damage and things like that but also of
22 changes in hydrology, change how those plants
23 because they have lived a very long time with a
24 particular condition and so those things need to

1 be taken into account.

2 When I was there there appeared to be a
3 lot of large trees. I didn't personally notice a
4 ton of what I would call high quality heritage
5 trees. There was a lot of trees that were what I
6 would call successional for the people who
7 understand horticulture and all those kinds of
8 things they are typically trees that just take
9 over when areas are left fallow or not maintained,
10 which clearly this property has not been
11 maintained in quite awhile.

12 I think that a consideration for the
13 proposal should be that a zoning change is not
14 allowed without a PUD process because I think
15 there is enough unique characteristics of the
16 neighborhood, there is enough people who are
17 existing residents, unfortunately some of those
18 residents are to the north and technically aren't
19 St. Charles residents but we should respect them
20 nonetheless, and I think that single family homes
21 on large scale lots have difficulty with a comfort
22 level and a perception of how a multi-family
23 project would, in fact, work with them going
24 forward.

1 I think that the buffers should utilize as
2 much of the existing topsoil and build berming and
3 things like to address increasing the buffer. I
4 think that the buffers around the entire property
5 north and south specifically, but I would also
6 feel that a buffer along 31 if, in fact, the
7 property is developed would help the residents
8 from traffic noise and things like that. And so I
9 think that reusing the topsoil in those areas
10 would be very valuable considering the
11 development, not only the buildings but all the
12 pavement, will displace all that topsoil.
13 So I think that that would be a worthwhile
14 thing.

15 There has been much conversation and I
16 appreciate the challenges that our residents have
17 with respect to drainage and how those things did
18 resolve or not been resolved with conversations
19 with the city. I don't think that this body is
20 really part of that. I think that what is the
21 charge of any development is to adhere to our
22 drainage standards as they are on the books today
23 and every project as I noted earlier does have to
24 do that. So whether it's the pond, whether it's

1 its BMPs, whether it's permeable pavers which is a
2 form of BMP, all of those things will be at the
3 developer's disposal to meet the drainage
4 requirements that the city has, and truly
5 unfortunately, it isn't the responsibility of the
6 developer to address drainage problems that are
7 not part of their property. And I feel for all of
8 you who have that issue, but I don't believe the
9 city can force them to address drainage problems
10 that they are really not a party to and had
11 nothing to do with.

12 But I will allow you to continue to air
13 your challenges and grievances with staff and/or
14 elected officials to hopefully assist you with
15 those real challenges that you have every day. So
16 I wish you luck with that part of it.

17 I think that the traffic study should be
18 absolutely warranted and for this project, buses
19 potentially coming in and out I think the geometry
20 is not the issue. I think it's going to be how
21 does the bus get in and out safely to make -- if
22 it needs to make a lefthand turn in when it's
23 going northbound so that they aren't sitting in
24 traffic because there is just two lanes there on

1 31 now. So does there need to be lane widenings,
2 deceleration lanes, right turn lane, all of those
3 things to safely address traffic, that can be done
4 through a traffic study.

5 IDOT will be a party to that since they
6 own the road and then there are all the more
7 straightforward aspects of site line distances,
8 what's call vertical curve analysis as far as
9 distance, which you can see oncoming traffic, all
10 of that would be part of a traffic study that
11 should be part of this project to be sure that
12 large scale vehicles especially buses if they have
13 to come and pick up even if it's six or 26
14 children in this property, that that can be done
15 safely for everyone involved, motorists and, of
16 course, the buses themselves and their occupants.

17 I think that there's a lot of density here
18 that myself personally I struggle with. Without
19 more effort being made to address the
20 compatibility with the surrounding single family
21 area. So to say that as a developer you want to
22 come in and just take R-2 zoning or RM-2 zoning
23 and only do it straight up, no process, straight
24 zoning, I think is a disservice to the neighboring

1 community because I think they have some real
2 issues and real questions and not that density is
3 bad, because I don't think it is. When it's
4 properly designed and properly buffered, I think
5 the adjacent properties can be compatible, but to
6 say that a straight zoning process and only
7 meaning what straight zoning requires I don't
8 think is adequate in this particular case.

9 So from a zoning change if that's all that
10 comes forward, I would have a hard time wanting to
11 agree to that under those conditions because I
12 think there is unique conditions that a PUD allows
13 to address are beyond straight zoning.

14 I thank the developer and everybody for
15 coming tonight. Again, this is the beginning of
16 the process. There is no end here today, and so I
17 encourage you to communicate with staff. If you
18 want to be have a broader reach on when the next
19 meetings are, pay attention to the website, talk
20 to your neighbors because all of this thing is on
21 the city's website.

22 And I thank you all for coming tonight. I
23 think that will conclude Item 5 for tonight.
24 Thank you.

1 (WHICH WERE ALL THE PROCEEDINGS HAD
2 IN THE ABOVE-ENTITLED CAUSE ON
3 THIS DATE.)
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

1 CERTIFICATE OF COURT REPORTER - NOTARY PUBLIC

2

3 I, Theresa A. Vorkapic, Certified
4 Shorthand Reporter No. 084-2589, CSR, RMR, CRR,
5 RPR, and a Notary Public in and for the County of
6 Kane, State of Illinois, the officer before whom
7 the foregoing public meeting was taken, do hereby
8 certify that the foregoing transcript is a true
9 and correct record of the testimony given; that
10 said testimony was taken by me and thereafter
11 reduced to typewriting under my direction; and
12 that I am neither counsel for, related to, nor
13 employed by any of the parties to this case and
14 have no interest, financial or otherwise, in its
15 outcome.

16 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my
17 hand and affixed my notarial seal this 14th day of
18 May, 2024.

19 My commission expires November 6, 2027.

20

Theresa A Vorkapic

21

22

THERESA A. VORKAPIC

23

NOTARY PUBLIC IN AND FOR ILLINOIS

24