

**MINUTES  
CITY OF ST. CHARLES, IL  
PLAN COMMISSION  
TUESDAY, JANUARY 29, 2013**

---

Members Present:            Todd Wallace, Chairman  
                                      Tim Kessler, Vice Chairman  
                                      Brian Doyle  
                                      Tom Schuetz  
                                      Curt Henningson  
                                      Tom Pretz

Members Absent:            Sue Amatangelo

Also Present:                Russell Colby, Planning Division Manager  
                                      Rita Tungare, Director of Community Development  
                                      Devin Lavigne, Houseal Lavigne Associates  
                                      Comprehensive Plan Task Force members: Chairman Mark  
                                      Armstrong, John Rabchuk, Betsy Penny

**1. Call to order**

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

**2. Roll Call**

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

**3. Presentation of minutes of the January 8, 2013 meeting.**

Mr. Doyle made a motion to amend the minutes of Chapter 4, Section 2-Vision, which was a discussion about the implications of the retail gap analysis. He added the language, "Acknowledging Mr. Lavigne's caution against misapplication of the retail gap analysis, Mr. Doyle said if we were, hypothetically, to infer...."

Mr. Doyle pointed out a typo on page 5, instead of character "note" approach, should read character "node" approach.

**A motion was made, seconded and unanimously passed by voice vote to accept the minutes of the January 8, 2013 meeting as amended.**

**4. Delnor Woods Subdivision (Lannert Group)**

Application for Map Amendment from BL Local Business District and RM-1 Mixed Medium Density Residential District to RE-2 Single Family Estate District  
Application for Preliminary Subdivision Plan  
Application for Final Plat of Subdivision

Supporting Documents:

- Preliminary Engineering Plans; dated 10/19/12, revised 1/4/13
- Tree Preservation and Landscape Plan; dated 4/18/12, received 1/15/13
- Final Plat of Subdivision; received 1/15/13

Mr. Colby said there was public hearing held on the Map Amendment application on Dec. 4, 2012, and what is before the Commission tonight are the applications for the Map Amendment, Preliminary Subdivision Plan and the Final Plat of Subdivision. He said staff completed a review of the project and documented comments in the staff report. Also distributed were handouts of the engineering review comments, which include the comments for preliminary engineering and final engineering. He said the recommendation for tonight is for preliminary engineering, which only had a few comments remaining that are not of great significance.

**Mr. Kessler made a motion to recommend approval of the Application for Map Amendment from BL Local Business District and RM-1 Mixed Medium Density Residential District to RE-2 Single Family Estate District, Application for Preliminary Subdivision Plan and Application for Final Plat of Subdivision, subject to resolution of staff comments contained in the memo. Motion seconded by Mr. Doyle**

Roll Call Vote:

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

Nays:

Absent: Amatangelo

Motion Carried.

**5. Review and Discussion of Comprehensive Plan Draft**

- Chapter 4: Land Use Plan
- Chapter 8: Sub Area Plans

Chairman Wallace said he felt it was prudent to set a time at which to adjourn the meeting and continue the hearing to the next meeting. He suggested no later than 9:00 PM. No objections from the Commission.

Mr. Colby said at the previous meeting the Commission discussed the first three chapters of the plan and did have some initial discussion on Chapter 4-Land Use Plan. He said staff has put together a table of all the comments and discussion points from the previous meeting and those will continue to be compiled as the Commission goes through the entire document. The purpose of compiling the comments is to give the Commission something to refer back to when giving their recommendation. He said the plan document in front of the Commission is the same as the one from the previous meeting and that the intent is not to continually update the plan document based on comments but rather to have all Commission comments compiled together when the recommendation is made so those comments can be forwarded to the Planning & Development Committee along with the draft of the plan produced by the Task Force, to allow the two items to be seen side by side.

## **Minutes – St. Charles Plan Commission**

**Tuesday, January 29, 2013**

**Page 3**

The plans were then set up on the projector for the audience to follow along.

Mr. Lavigne said the plan was to work through the plan chapter by chapter but the discussion at the last meeting was constantly flipping back to Chapter 8, Subarea plans. He said there was a request at the last meeting for an analysis of the new plan versus the old plan, which was difficult to do because the land use categories were different. They didn't stick to the same land use designations that the previous plan did but that they tried to match it up the best they could on the maps. He said that the bottom footer of the overlay lists the new land use designation but that it is important to note that it is not zoning and has nothing to do with anything like lot size, but rather development character. Mr. Lavigne went through the land use comparison maps for the existing plan and the 2013 Comprehensive Plan for; rural single-family residential, single-family detached, single-family attached, multi-family residential, neighborhood & corridor and industrial/business parks.

Chairman Wallace asked if on the industrial/business map along Bricher Rd., south of Rt. 38, if that is behind the existing Meijer. Mr. Colby said yes and the previous designation was office, so it's a comparable designation.

Mr. Lavigne said he is not sure how telling the overlay is, except for the small parcels near the gas station by Dean St. where it used to be residential and some have turned to commercial. Mr. Schuetz said in doing this exercise it appears that the city has somewhat followed the previous plan, without any glaring discrepancies.

Mr. Wallace asked if the audience had any question and also noted that the comparison overlay is available on line. No question from the audience.

### Chapter 8-Subarea Plans-Downtown

Mr. Lavigne said the purpose of examining the targeted subareas is to provide more specific recommendation for the areas of the city that are of most concern to residents, are most likely to change, face increase redevelopment pressure, have significant vacant or underutilized properties, are "tired" and in need of revitalization, or all of the above. He said each subarea plan starts with goals, objectives, a vision and then a recommendation for physical changes in land use which is intended to provide framework for the important areas of the city. He said they studied Downtown, the West Gateway, the East Gateway and the Main St. Corridor.

Mr. Lavigne said the highlighted area on the map on page 65 identifies what is zoned CBD-1 and CBD-2; there are also goals and some more strategic objectives. He said there is a framework plan which looks at image and character and highlighted what is identified as the Historic District along with different landmarks. He said there are different types of frontages on the map in blue to break down the treatment of the site. For example, if a site is on Main St., it should have strong orientation to Main St. He said the green indicates gateway corridors which are the approach corridors from the north and south and buildings along those have strong orientation to those streets. He said the Fox River frontage says it's important not to ignore the river like past development did and treated it more as a transportation amenity as opposed to a public amenity which is critical. He said page 66

## Minutes – St. Charles Plan Commission

Tuesday, January 29, 2013

Page 4

details what those different frontages mean and also identifies some more specifics related to each frontage, building massing and placement, the façade orientation and design, the architectural style and design, vehicular access and parking, bicycle and pedestrian, and land use. He said basically what is being said is for Main St. is that there should not be any driveways or curb cuts, but a continuous street wall of buildings. When a building or site is sitting on both, like the corner of Riverside Ave. and Main St., that site has two frontages, both recommendations would apply so one does not trump the other.

Mr. Lavigne said the Downtown Improvement Plan on page 67 highlights some of the different recommendations. The plan addresses the Downtown Retail Overlay District, saying in the short term to lift the restrictions for businesses to locate within downtown and as retail demand picks up to revisit the restriction. He said the yellow circles on page 67 are the key gateways into downtown and show potential recommendations for gateway improvements. He said there is already great wayfindings for some destinations throughout downtown and this just looks for ways to expand it. He said making Main St. and Route 31 pedestrian friendly streets will be a challenge to work with IDOT, but it was heard consistently that it's very loud and not friendly. In working with their team's engineer, there was a suggestion to diamond cut or diamond groove concrete streets to reduce noise. He said parking lots and gaps in the sidewalk network should be addressed to have a more cohesive pedestrian network. He said 16 catalyst sites have been identified for downtown as to how each could be developed, why it's a catalyst site and what the opportunity may be, and those are explained on pages 68 & 69. He page 70 shows a downtown redevelopment concept which is not a development plan but just a more lush development concept to get residents excited and supportive.

Chairman Wallace opened up to the Commission for comments and discussion.

Mr. Schuetz asked how the gateway circles were determined on page 57. Mr. Lavigne said those signs would not just be welcome to St. Charles, but would be welcome to downtown St. Charles to more brand and identify downtown, they would be different than the gateway signs that exist around the community. He said they tried to identify where opportunity exists either within the right of way or on public property like Baker Park, schools, railroad embankment etc. He said Prairie and Rt. 31 is tricky because there is a lot going and that area may be best served by additional study because there are a lot of uses comingled together.

Mr. Doyle said that in the packet there was a staff memo about last minute conversations by the Task Force that noted on page 59 that the map is missing the marking for future bike routes along Prairie St. from 3<sup>rd</sup> St. to west to Randall Rd., and the map on page 67 is also missing that indicator. He said that the Task Force did agree that a bike route was wanted along Prairie, and another aspect of the complication of the Prairie and Rt. 31 intersection, in his experience, is coming down 7<sup>th</sup> St. to Rt. 31 has a very steep incline and if you're on a bike and not careful you could end up right in the middle of the intersection. In terms of pedestrian and bike friendliness, it represents a challenge and further study done could be helpful but at what point do we need to talk about the prospects of widening Prairie or corridor improvements along Prairie since it is a collector street.

Chairman Wallace asked for comments/question from the audience.

## **Minutes – St. Charles Plan Commission**

**Tuesday, January 29, 2013**

**Page 5**

James Zukowski-PO Box 252-asked about the consideration to reduce the restrictions along Route 64 to help fill in empty store fronts, and if that is temporary, when would be the timeframe end and what would then happen to those businesses. He said that process would cause the same type of comingling of businesses as Route 31 and Prairie currently has. Mr. Armstrong said the plan itself would not actually bring about that change, the plan suggests that such a change would be a good idea and if that would happen, there would need to be an amendment to the Zoning Ordinance, come through Plan Commission and a public hearing, and all terms would be discussed then. He said the observation was that when the Zoning Ordinance was adopted, it was to adopt a retail overlay for retail only on the first floor, with the idea that non-retail uses were choking out retail uses, and right now there are plenty of vacancies and the retail uses are not filling them, and that's why the Task Force thought the restriction should be walked back a bit, but it was not discussed far enough to say how far exactly and exactly when it ends. He said although Mr. Zukowski has good questions, they are not really the function of a document like this, but the function of the actual ordinance that takes place later on. Mr. Zukowski said he understands but those are question that do need to be addressed in that type of discussion.

Mr. Zukowski said in regard to the perceptual view of downtown, it looks like Riverside south of Illinois disappears as a drivable area which could cause some challenges for the fire dept. heading south.

Chairman Wallace said as we go through this there is a lot of information we are taking in and he doesn't think that anyone on the Commission intends say that once a section is reviewed and there has been a discussion on it, that it is then foreclosed to any changes of recommendations and that at future meetings chapters can be revisited by both the Commission and the residents.

### Chapter 8-Subarea Plans-West Gateway

Mr. Lavigne said this subarea has a similar presentation as the Downtown, including the overview, what the area is, and the goals and objectives for the area. He said one thing they wanted to draw attention to is how Randall Rd. differs from the communities to the south and north and that it is evident that it is changing how to plan and build a corridor. He said on page 73, the red dots indicate the driveway/curb cuts and the yellow indicates traffic signals, and traffic moves fairly well through S. Elgin, Geneva and Batavia, but St. Charles sort of slows down and it's because of all the curb cuts. He said S. Elgin is the newest example and they have parallel access drives that connect all the developments which are why they function better. He said these are presented as a comparison as well as something to strive to achieve to identify in the subsequent plan to close curb cuts and restrict access, move Randall Rd. in St. Charles to something that functions better.

Mr. Lavigne said on page 74 is the improvement plan where key gateway intersections are identified with Randall Rd. being a great north/south regional road with a lot of people passing through St. Charles who are stopped at the intersections. These intersections are location to make some impactful streetscape that would foster positive perception of St. Charles. He said the need for streetscaping along Randall Rd. is highlighted as well as where buffering is needed to better insulate the residential uses from commercial activity, parking improvements, areas with existing surface parking lots without any landscape islands or screening. He said sidewalk gaps are highlighted in

## **Minutes – St. Charles Plan Commission**

**Tuesday, January 29, 2013**

**Page 6**

red along with the sidewalk connections, but if those do not connect to businesses, it's not much good, but extending the sidewalks through the parking lots connecting to the front of Meijer would improve the walkability of the corridor. He said the blue arrows indicate additional street connections. The Bricher orientation, where Taco Bell is, has some uses along Route 38, as opposed to having commercial retail two blocks deep, try to promote Bricher orientation for that development. He said the dotted blue line is where internal cross access is needed because once you leave a business you should be able to go from parking lot to parking lot, you should not have to go back out to Randall Rd. to access businesses.

Mr. Lavigne said there are 12 catalyst sites highlighted on page 75 which describe the opportunity for each. He said page 76 shows the former St. Charles Mall along with conceptual land use bubbles, and there has been a lot of resident input for no residential on this site and there is no question that the community is divided over how the site should be redeveloped. He said the thought process here is that coming up with one option for the site could table this plan indefinitely and what is most important is that the site is developed under a PUD and that the property owner work closely with the residents to come up with an agreed upon plan. He said they came up with three alternatives which are illustrated on page 76 which are: Local Town Center, Comprehensive Mixed Use Center and Regional Repositioning. Although Shodeen has stated that Jewel is not willing to relocate, it has been heard that big box retail is wanted but the reality is that it would need to front Randall Rd., it cannot be behind the Jewel.

Mr. Kessler asked if there had been any thought to have a conversation with Shodeen seeing as that the Jewel company has been sold and there will be multiple stores closing around Chicago. Mr. Lavigne said they have not and when Shodeen made that statement, it didn't make them want to tear up the plan, they still think it's a viable alternative to reposition the Jewel because he has seen Jewel tear downs and rebuilds, but he is not sure they would give up their Randall Rd. frontage but they are a business and they might be open to it.

Mr. Henningson said he thought the Randall Rd. connectivity comparison was fascinating in terms of the curb cuts and the difference between S. Elgin, it was very interesting.

Mr. Doyle said in regard to viability and desired land uses not necessarily being viable according to market, and regarding the three concept plans on page 76, are all the plans viable, or is it possible to rate them on their viability on a scale of 1-10. Mr. Lavigne said those plans are not flushed out, they are land use bubbles. Depending on the intensity of each pocket, they all have some viability, but whatever the plan is, the property owner needs to work with the residents because even the land use bubbles do not provide enough direction. Mr. Doyle said his first thought was if they are not viable they should not be in the plan but to hear they are all viable, it's important to make certain that everything put forward meets that test. Mr. Lavigne said he doesn't necessarily think one of the plans will be chosen but it's an alternative that a few of them mesh together.

Mr. Scheutz said he also found it fascinating on page 73, the significant difference of the surrounding communities with the curb cuts as you come through St. Charles, and he asked if curb cuts are always something considered to get rid of. Mr. Colby said the city does not have a specific program in place. A lot of the properties were developed over many years and the character of

## **Minutes – St. Charles Plan Commission**

**Tuesday, January 29, 2013**

**Page 7**

Randall Rd. is drastically different than it is today and the issues are that properties are entitled to certain access points and the regulatory authority over the road is the one who has control over whether or not a curb cut can be closed, and Randall Rd. is a county road, not a city street. He said although we look for opportunities to improve access and consolidating areas like this, there is not a program to facilitate that or force a property has to close a curb cut. Mr. Schuetz asked if this is based on S. Elgin because they are a newer development and have more control. Mr. Colby said yes, it reflects best development practices but also the county has more stringent access policies now than they did at the time the St. Charles portion was originally developed. Ms. Tungare said St. Charles deals with more piece meal development that has happened historically over the years but that cross access is definitely something that is on the Comp. Plan's radar screen along with reduction of curb cuts, but the current condition is what it is. Mr. Henningson said a good example is the current McDonalds site where they are working on reducing curb cuts. Mr. Lavigne said you can see on the figures how the Fairgrounds disrupts everything and it would be great if you could get from Costco to Meijer without having to go onto Randall Rd.

Mr. Doyle said he does not like the first bubble (Regional Repositioning); he feels its uninspired and in looking at the considerations of the third bullet point- "represents no significant deviation from the current Randall Rd. development pattern or function, adds no unique character elements to Randall Rd. corridor", he thinks it represents a concept that takes Randall Rd. as a undifferentiated retail strip that stretches from S. Elgin all the way down to Batavia, and he feels this site offers more potential than that and there needs to be something special there. He said the Task Force never had a consensus on what to put here, and there are a variety of different concept plans but his concern is that there is not enough clarity provided in terms of assessing the proposal that comes forward which takes him back to needing to go back to the subarea goals and objectives, and agreeing on those first in order to assess how well these concept plans address those objectives. He said the fact that he does not like that plan does not mean he would argue for it to be taken out, but he thinks more clarity needs to be provided and whittle it down to something that is more inspirational and reflects more of the potential this site has to offer. Mr. Schuetz said he just sees these bubbles as a thought provoking guide for the future and five years from now people will be different and it's thought provoking and he disagrees with Mr. Doyle. Mr. Doyle said these were what were presented at a public workshop. Mr. Lavigne said he wouldn't say that the Task Force created these, but they took the feedback heard from the community and sensed there was no consensus, they came up with about 8 or 9 concepts and they refined them and came up with these three. He cannot stress enough the generality of the concepts; they are designed to provoke thought.

Mr. Doyle said he is eager to hear from the audience what they want in regard to big box because he has concerns in regard to the longevity and the ability to reuse the buildings that fail and he feels we can do better. Mr. Kessler said he agrees and an ordinance should be in place where they can be removed once empty for periods of time, and he also does not believe that area does not lend itself more to mixed use with some residential, he feels it does, and traffic controls will need to be done on Prairie whether residential is there or not because it is not a gateway, it's just the rest of Randall Rd.

Mr. Doyle said on the subarea goals and objectives, is it a viable goal and objective to somehow capture the idea of promoting commercial and traffic connections between this catalyst sites and

## **Minutes – St. Charles Plan Commission**

**Tuesday, January 29, 2013**

**Page 8**

downtown, can this site be a gateway and a feeder to downtown business and commerce. Mr. Lavigne said he is not sure how to quantify that but certainly the more time spent in the community, the better, but certainly the goal is for wayfinding signage saying “downtown St. Charles this way”, to lead them downtown. Chairman Wallace asked if there should be some contemplation as to whether it’s providing feeder to St. Charles or Geneva because we are proposing to place a gateway development like this on the road that goes right into downtown Geneva. Mr. Doyle said this goes back to improvements to Prairie St., and he shares the concern of the public that particularly if this catalyst site were to be supported through a TIF fund and a TIF downtown, you have two TIFs with the potential to cannibalize each other, so the concern is how do we build a town center development that does not take away business from our real town center which is downtown by the river and to also not send them to another downtown. He said he is suggesting that a goal somehow should be to balance the needs of commercial development on this site and he would like to think there is a way to do this to get away from the either or proposition. Mr. Lavigne said those are great goals and he does not know that any of the three options shut the door, but he agrees on the big box and there being a bond put in place for tear downs. He said big box is not his preferred land use for the site but that is what was heard from the community. Mr. Doyle asked if it would be advisable to add a bullet point to either the subarea goals or objectives on page 72 that somehow articulates the desire to achieve a balance between development on this site and downtown that are complimentary. Mr. Lavigne said yes, you want to create destinations in the community that compliment, not compete. Mr. Schuetz asked if there is was a way to consider the history of St. Charles and to mention it in this site versus downtown and tie them together with historical style signage. Mr. Lavigne said that’s a great idea and they could craft something like that.

Mr. Henningson said he was impressed by the plan which repeatedly mentioned market viability, because whatever the land use is has to be viable, and that will solve any issue with anything put on that site.

Audience comments:

Vanessa Bell-Lasota-1610 Howard St.-said she compliments the plan but she does think in the goals and objectives or somewhere in those aspirational statements there is a statement about within the mixed use catalyst sites creating a synergy so that they do not cannibalize each other but one draws people across to the other. She said she feels this is a way to clarify the plan and make it more inspirational. She said the way to keep the specialness is embedded in there somewhere, but the specialness will be determined by what weight our aspirational goals and objectives have, and what weight that the St. Charles 2013 chapter will have in the plan, and also how much account a prospective developer will take with those aspects of the plan. She said when the Plan Commission is called to assess a developer’s concept in comparison to the Comprehensive Plan, what weight will those aspirational statements have when the bottom line is market viability versus specialness.

### Chapter 8-Subarea Plans-East Gateway

Mr. Lavigne said on page 80 the East Gateway is presented in the same fashion as the others, with an overview of the goals and the objectives for the area. He said the goals are: to maximize the locational assets within the area; improve connectivity and circulation; attractive streets with the key

## **Minutes – St. Charles Plan Commission**

**Tuesday, January 29, 2013**

**Page 9**

being the mall and where there are gateway intersections with a lot of motorists pass through, so it's a chance to put your best foot forward. He said on page 81, the primary and secondary streets are identified, with the primary streetscaping being along the major corridors and within the industrial areas on secondary streets, streetscaping is almost void. He said some buffering is also highlighted primarily between the mall and the neighborhood to the north. The plan calls for landscaping reduction along Main St. because it's nice to have landscaping to hide some unsightly areas but when it starts to block businesses it's a problem for retail viability. He said gaps in the sidewalk are highlighted as well as where connectivity needs to be made to get people from the sidewalks to the fronts of businesses, and also the opportunity for street connections to put more of a gridded street network into the industrial park as well as the key connection to extend the road to the north of the mall. He said internal cross access is the same as the West Gateway, and then removal of the frontage road, which only works if it's in place for the entire length.

Mr. Lavigne said 10 different catalyst sites are identified on page 82, the Charlestowne Mall being the biggest one. As it stands, if you're on Foxfield, you have to make a right to get into the mall, so the east/west traffic, by nature, leads into the neighborhood, and the suggestion is for the east/west traffic to stay south of the neighborhood with the residents having to make a deliberate left, and that would greatly reduce cut-through traffic. He said some areas have been highlighted for additional outlot development along with the repositioning of the mall, which is explored in generalities on page 84, where 3 different alternatives are displayed; "Main Street" Shopping District, Entertainment and Events Center and Town Center East. Mr. Schuetz asked if a consideration could be made call it the "Main St. Shopping-East" destination, to not take away from the downtown district which is just Main St., and then something also call Main St. Shopping-West, where signs would say to not forget to visit the other districts but the themes would be the same as the signage, colors and landscaping and he thinks that would bring people through the community. . Mr. Schuetz said but right now it's so fragmented you don't know where to go, people coming from out of town have no idea where to go.

Mr. Doyle said he was not present at the Task Force meeting where the Entertainment and Event Center was discussed and he wanted to know if there was a need for something like that in town. Mr. Lavigne said that is what was heard at workshops along with ice skating, pond to go fishing but really just a community gathering space. Mr. Schuetz said maybe something like Ravinia where people would travel.

### Chapter 8-Main Street Subarea Plan

Mr. Lavigne said they focused primarily on the right of way and the vision and goals focus more to the function of Main St. and it's such a long corridor they did struggle on how to present it best and the legend on page 89 goes into detail. He said they highlighted existing traffic signals and proposed ones and additional roadway connections, which are mostly carried forward from the other subarea plans with the exception of utilizing the railroad as an east/west street that would provide access to the rear of the properties on the east side. He said intersection realignment is highlighted, IDOT capital improvement area, opportunities to extend a landscape median, reduce curb cuts, proposed cross access, sidewalks, onsite pedestrian connections, enhanced pedestrian crossings, existing/future trail or bikeways, roadway surface diamond grind, parking lot/site screening and

## Minutes – St. Charles Plan Commission

Tuesday, January 29, 2013

Page 10

transit activity node. He said they suggest at the west end a potential signal into Corporate Reserves, realign Campton Hills Rd. and Main St., additional buffering/screening east of Randall, and improving pedestrian crossing at Dean St. and 12<sup>th</sup> St. Mr. Kessler noted that pedestrian the crossing at 12<sup>th</sup> Street is no longer located where shown.

Mr. Lavigne said they suggest the existing abandoned railroad be utilized as a street south of Main Street, which could allow businesses on Main St. to have rear access. The plan is to explore moving the road and also some additional IDOT improvements/connections. Mr. Scheutz asked if these last pages are all recommendations to consider for change. Mr. Lavigne said correct. Mr. Scheutz said there is a lot of fine print and would it make sense to have bolder letter on each page to state recommendation or change, because it would really draw attention to the detail. Mr. Lavigne said yes, maybe instead of the word legend it could say “legend of recommended improvements”. Mr. Scheutz said yes, because it’s overwhelming and that would draw attention to it.

Mr. Doyle noted that on page 75-catalyst sites, there is site L-Valley Shopping Center and on page 74 there is a map that shows street connections for that site between 15<sup>th</sup> and Walnut. In chapter 8, there are street connections in a number of areas, but that parcel is on the map but the street connections are not displayed and would it be useful to mark them on page 91. Mr. Lavigne said good point, to make it consistent.

Ms. Bell-Lasota asked how a catalyst site that is not in the plan could be added and by what mechanism does an addendum get added to the plan. Mr. Lavigne said any site can redevelop in the community and the thought of including catalyst sites is to call attention to the sites that have the strongest potential for change, or are highlighted by residents at workshops. Identifying them and describing what the site could be is also assisting the development community with a sense of some certainty, but he is not sure adding a site would have to go to the level that the previous plan amendment went to. Ms. Tungare said that is would not have to go back to the Task Force but could be amended by Plan Commission and Planning & Development Committee.

Mr. Doyle said the Plan Commission has talked recently, with the consideration of the Bus Barn, about the future of the group of parcels on the east side of Randall Rd., between Main St. and Dean St., or the future Woodward Dr., and he wonders if that is something that warrants mention in the plan. He said there is an indication of street connections, like Woodward Dr., and on page 58 there is an internal circulator or traffic lane shown on the east side of Randall Rd. going north, but the problem with the parcel is that it is difficult to develop commercial because its choppy and there is no internal circulation particularly along that stretch of Randall Rd. where there is no light, and you cannot get into it. He said it will never be developed until those street connections are made, including the connection displayed in the plan on 17<sup>th</sup> St. at Main St. He thinks the whole thing is a group of catalyst sites and his question is, how do we get from where we are now, to where we need to be for that group of parcels to fulfill its potential. He said the Commission approved a controversial application for the Bus Barn because it was a stepping stone to get the parcels where they need to be and he wonders if these parcels need to be attended to in the Comprehensive Plan. Mr. Lavigne said the place to highlight it would be page 75. Mr. Henningson noted that the plan already talks about Woodward somewhere. Mr. Lavigne said yes, on page 74 it shows what the street configuration would look like, extending Woodward down to 15<sup>th</sup> and alongside township

**Minutes – St. Charles Plan Commission**

**Tuesday, January 29, 2013**

**Page 11**

property, but it does not address the redevelopment and this it's not one catalyst site but a collection and he wondered if it would be better identified on the figure as a bubble. Ms. Tungare asked if the land use map addresses it. Mr. Lavigne said the land use map addresses it as red-Corridor Commercial as sort of a general land use designation. Mr. Doyle said his understanding is it will not be developed as a corridor commercial at this point, until a light gets installed and it's kind of a chicken and egg problem. Mr. Lavigne said he knows the community is not big on TIF's but that may need a TIF to coordinate the development between different properties and put in a public improvement like a new road and traffic signal. Ms. Tungare asked Mr. Doyle if he was thinking more in terms of plan B, if plan A doesn't materialize in terms of Corridor Commercial and all the improvements going in being contemplated. Mr. Doyle said he was drawing attention to a discussion that came up earlier about where this whole set of sites needs to go and all the things that need to fall in place for that to happen and he thinks other members of the commission as well as anyone that was present at those public hearings will remember those points, but they are not imbedded yet in this document. He said as far as what is being prescribed as a solution, he does not have an answer to that, and he just knows those were considerations in the application. He said looking at the land use, what he is hearing is that it is too difficult for consumers to get into those lots, so those property owners cannot build it out to what is wanted because traffic circulation is not there right now.

Ms. Tungare said she acknowledges that some of the improvements contemplated are a chicken and egg situation and there is no guarantee, but having said that, how do we resolve the issue in the comprehensive planning process. She asked if they should accommodate another plan in terms of how the property should develop or does policy direction need to be spelled out in terms of prioritizing how the improvements contemplated should occur, like a sequence of events. Mr. Doyle said he likes Mr. Lavigne's suggestion of adding a new catalyst site bubble on page 75 and having some narrative that explains some of the issues and challenges for the site in terms of realizing what the future land use map designates as our goal would at least suffice to capture it as a consideration and something that the city is aware of. He said they could hold off on trying to formulate solutions to it or a plan for how to get there but just capture it as an issue that needs attention.

Mr. Henningson said right now the land use is Corridor Regional Commercial and on page 74 there is a map showing potential drives to be put in and he does not see a need to highlight it as a separate catalyst site. Mr. Kessler said he agrees with Mr. Doyle because it was done for the intersection of Rt. 38 and Randall, the mall on the east side, and this is another gateway and it makes sense to make suggestions as to possible uses for that area. He said we are doing it for other areas and it should be done for this one also.

Mr. Lavigne said not all sites can be identified, but he is not sure why that area was not addressed, but that they can add text to document the fact that the site is hampered by access and there are some commercial uses repurposing older industrial buildings and that the redevelopment of the site is going to need to take a more coordinated approach as opposed to piece meal, parcel by parcel, because he does not think any of those sites will ever be incrementally redeveloped and therefore there will need to be some type of assistance from the city. Mr. Doyle said he thinks the commercial frontage is the most important and he does not know if the connector street necessarily needs to go back as far as 17<sup>th</sup> St. but to at least go to around 19<sup>th</sup> St. Mr. Lavigne said they could

**Minutes – St. Charles Plan Commission**

**Tuesday, January 29, 2013**

**Page 12**

put in the text that consideration could also be given to redeveloping the industrial uses east of there. Mr. Doyle said yes and potentially all the way up to Dean St. and he thinks developing the full commercial potential of Randall Rd. is important to the community and this is an area where it will not happen without some coordination. Mr. Kessler said he feels these are significant entrances into the city where traffic is coming in from Elgin and it's an entrance point for the city and should be addressed because there is Randall Rd. frontage at all 4 intersections there and now is the time to talk about in the Comprehensive Plan.

Chairman Wallace said there is so much substance in the sections just discussed and he wondered if it would be helpful to before the next meeting for commission members to individually prepare a list of modifications and suggestions and then to go back through the subarea section by section. Mr. Doyle asked if those comments would be part of the packet. Chairman Wallace said he doesn't think so but he doesn't know of a better way to do it.

Chairman Wallace said there is a site on the northwest corner of Main St. and Randall which has been undeveloped for a long time, and why is that not listed as a catalyst site. He would like to have a discussion on that and he feels it's the commission's responsibility to go through it in more of a comprehensive manner rather than just picking one thing here, and one thing there to discuss in the course of a two hour meeting and for those reasons he thinks making a list would be beneficial. Ms. Tungare said she thinks the commission did an excellent job today with the subarea plan in terms of targeting some key issues and providing substantial feedback, she suggested that in the next week or so, in the spirit of efficiency, to send Mr. Colby an email with individual commission members comments and they could then be compiled and presented at the next meeting.

Mr. Lavigne said that site was not flagged because it's a very small site and it wouldn't necessarily have a catalytic effect. Chairman Wallace said in looking at the area as a whole, he is a bit resistant to list out which parcels should be included in the catalyst site and he doesn't see any reason why a site shouldn't span a road if the same goal goes for both sites. He said it's not necessarily ruling out ongoing businesses on certain sites and included in that should be the northeast corner of Randall/Main for consideration as to what should be there long term. Mr. Lavigne cautioned the commission to not highlight every vacant piece of property but to look at the sites that have the chance to have a catalytic effect on adjacent properties. He said the justification for a catalyst site is critical size and to come up with some challenges where they could offer some insight for the development community. Chairman Wallace said that is part of the commission's roll as leaders and planners to give some idea why that site isn't developed. Mr. Armstrong recalled there was someone identified as wanting to go there and there was some litigation in federal court, none related to the site itself but related to the business plan and the company that went on for a number of years and that is one of the reasons the site got tied up. Mr. Colby added that for a number of years it's been owned by a company that wanted to construct a gas station and they were unable to obtain right to access onto Randall Rd. from Kane County.

Mr. Henningson suggested putting the rest of the chapters on next meeting's agenda which gives an opening to make a recommendation if there is time to do so. Chairman Wallace said to submit recommendations to Mr. Colby to compile those into the staff report. Mr. Colby said he anticipated that those would be more discussions points at the next meeting and then at the following meeting,

**Minutes – St. Charles Plan Commission**

**Tuesday, January 29, 2013**

**Page 13**

once they were all compiled, we would go through the list and make decisions on the items. He said they would hope to have those posted Monday before the meeting. Mr. Henningson suggested making sure all comments or recommendations are very specific because generalities will not work.

**Mr. Pretz made a motion to continue the public meeting for the Comprehensive Plan to February 5, 2013 in the Council Chamber. Mr. Doyle seconded the motion.**

Roll Call Vote:

Ayes: Kessler, Wallace, Doyle, Schuetz, Henningson, Pretz, Amatangelo

Nays:

Absent: Amatangelo

Motion Carried.

**6. Meeting Announcements**

Tuesday, February 5, 2013 at 7:00pm Council Chambers

Tuesday, February 26, 2013 at 7:00pm Century Station Training Room

Tuesday, March 5, 2013 at 7:00pm Council Chambers

Mr. Colby stated the Feb. 19 meeting would likely be rescheduled to the following Tuesday, Feb. 26 due to a room conflict with the City Council meeting.

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

**8. Adjournment at 9:10 p.m.**