

**MINUTES
CITY OF ST. CHARLES, IL
PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE
TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 12, 2018 7:00 P.M.**

Members Present: Stellato, Silkaitis, Payleitner, Lemke, Turner, Bancroft, Gaugel, Vitek, Lewis

Members Absent: Bessner

Others Present: Mayor Raymond Rogina; Mark Koenen, City Administrator; Rita Tungare, Director of Community & Economic Development; Russell Colby, Community Development Division Manager; Matthew O'Rourke, Economic Development Division Manager; Bob Vann, Building & Code Enforcement Manager; Mark LaChappell, Building & Code Enforcement Supervisor; Fire Chief Schelstreet, Asst. Chief Christensen

1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was convened by Vice Chairman Stellato at 7:00 P.M.

2. ROLL CALLED

Roll was called:

Present: Stellato, Silkaitis, Payleitner, Lemke, Bancroft, Gaugel, Vitek, Lewis, Turner

Absent: Bessner

3. COMMUNITY & ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

- a. Recommendation to approve a revised Exhibit "P" to the Façade Improvement Agreement for 225 W. Main St. (Homebrew Shop).

Mr. Colby said the City approved a Façade Improvement Grant for this property back in 2016. The project included renovation of the west wall of the building facing 3rd Street. The total grant amount was \$20,000 which is the maximum amount available under the grant program. Due to unforeseen structural issues, more extensive demolition and reconstruction was required than what was originally planned. As a result, the project scope was expanded and certain changes were made to the plans. The most significant change was the use of fiber cement siding as a primary façade material. The staff requested the owners submit an updated scope of work and architectural elevation to attach to the grant agreement to reflect these changes. The grant amount remains the same. These changes have been reviewed by the Historic Preservation Commission.

Aldr. Lewis expressed concern with putting siding on the building versus a stone or brick material to keep it in context with the other buildings in the downtown area. She asked for an explanation as to why this option was chosen and approved.

Steve Gibson, Vice Chairman of the Historic Preservation Commission, said that type of covering, once it's done, will represent stucco, which is what is on a number of the buildings downtown. It will have the same type of surface on it and hold paint in the same way. He said the last time this was applied, it was done incorrectly. It was trapping water inside the brick. The original brick on the building was not made to be waterproof. This caused water damage on the inside of the building and to the brick. When they began ripping off the side, they found the brick had started to disintegrate. The way the cement board is going to be installed will provide a space in between that will allow the moisture to wick out of the brick, keep the building dry, and preserve the material underneath it. The outside will look the same as if it had been stuccoed on the original surface of the building.

Aldr. Lewis asked if it will be overlapping siding as seen on a house. Mr. Colby confirmed that it will be. Aldr. Lewis asked if the Commission felt this was an appropriate use and if they would approve this for any other building downtown. Mr. Gibson said they consider things based on scale and fit, and in scale, this fits this building. He said he can't say carte blanche would be given for other buildings. Aldr. Lewis felt they could come up with something better to make this more appropriate with the surrounding buildings. Mr. Gibson said this fits based on its architectural and historical significance. Aldr. Lewis said this is a prominent location and a valuable building, and it would be worthwhile to make the investment into using something other than cement board.

Vice Chairman Stellato referenced a renovated historic building in Batavia that had very small clapboards. They used Hardie board molded to fit the exact size. From a distance it matched exactly to what was there. Aldr. Lewis expressed interest in taking a look at that building.

Kim Malay, Historic Preservation Commissioner, said it also has to do with the health of the building. This may be the best solution to help keep it dry.

Aldr. Bancroft made a motion to approve a revised Exhibit "I" to the Façade Improvement Agreement for 225 W. Main St. (Homebrew Shop). Seconded by Aldr. Gaugel.

Roll was called:

Ayes: Lemke, Turner, Bancroft, Gaugel, Vitek, Silkaitis, Payleitner

Absent: Bessner

Recused:

Nays: Lewis

Motion carried 7-1

- b. Historic Preservation Commission recommendation to deny a Certificate of Appropriateness for demolition of the primary structure and rear addition of 217 Cedar Ave.

Mr. Colby stated the Committee last reviewed this item in November 2017. The Historic Preservation Commission recommended denial of the request for demolition. At the November

Committee meeting, it was requested that consideration for the item be postponed for 90 days so additional information could be gathered. It is now approximately 90 days from that meeting date. Since the last discussion, the Historic Preservation Commissioners toured the interior of the house to view the condition. They felt the building appeared to be in good condition, but it did require some maintenance. The Commission also invited Dan Otto, a restoration contractor, to take a look at the building and provide his assessment of it. He also felt it was in good condition and the restoration would be purely cosmetic work. He could provide a cost estimate if a project scope is defined. Kurt Muehlfelt, a building moving contractor, assessed the building to see if it could be moved. He estimated it would cost \$100,000 to move the structure. This cost does not include any costs to move obstructions in the moving path or any costs associated with the new location.

The item is back before the Committee for further direction. Vice Chairman Stellato asked if there has been any other activity associated with this property. Did the church have any interest in the property, or did they look into the ability to move the house?

Reverend Mary Zajac, Pastor at the Baker Memorial United Methodist Church, said they do not have approval to sell the property. They have had one person contact them with interest in the property, but they have not pursued that because they have no context in which to do so. Aldr. Lewis asked for further clarification. Reverend Zajac said the church has a very lengthy process to get to a decision. It involves putting a yes or no decision on the table and getting the entire congregation to vote on it. They went through that process to get to this point, but they do not have a yes or no decision on whether or not to sell it, or under what conditions they would sell it. She said the decision they made was to demolish it. Until they get that completed, they have no reason to pursue other options.

Aldr. Payleitner questioned whether or not the church did anything within the 90 day postponement. Reverend Zajac said the church cannot go forward. They would need to reconvene the planning team and come up with proposals and weigh each one. However, they have had no change in context for them to do that. She said she has nothing to offer the congregation at this point in regards to what their options are.

Aldr. Lewis asked if the church reviewed Dan Otto's letter with their congregation. Reverend Zajac said the trustees are aware of it, but it was not presented to the entire congregation.

Aldr. Lewis made a motion to approve the Historic Preservation Commission's recommendation to deny a Certificate of Appropriateness for demolition of the primary structure and rear addition of 217 Cedar Ave. Seconded by Aldr. Silkaitis.

Roll was called:

Ayes: Lemke, Bancroft, Gaugel, Vitek, Lewis, Silkaitis, Payleitner

Absent: Bessner

Recused:

Nays: Turner

Motion carried 7-1

- c. Recommendation to direct staff to issue a Request for Proposals for First Street Redevelopment- Buildings 6, 7B and 8.

Mr. Colby said the remaining building lots known as 6, 7B and 8 are the final phases to complete the overall First Street redevelopment project. The City Council held a workshop in January to discuss these remaining lots and provided direction to staff to draft a Request for Proposals to solicit development interest in these lots. The staff has prepared a draft RFP for the Committee's consideration. Staff is seeking feedback on that draft; particularly on Section V: The City Interests, Section VII: Developer Selection Process, and Section VIII: Selection Criteria. The selection criteria and the ranking of those criteria are the most important items where feedback would be helpful.

Vice Chairman asked if the Committee had any comments. No further comments were made.

Aldr. Turner made a motion to approve staff to issue a Request for Proposals for First Street Redevelopment- Buildings 6, 7B and 8. Seconded by Aldr. Bancroft.

Roll was called:

Ayes: Silkaitis, Payleitner, Lemke, Turner, Bancroft, Gaugel, Vitek, Lewis

Absent: Bessner

Recused:

Nays:

Motion carried 8-0

- 4. ADDITIONAL BUSINESS-None.**
- 5. EXECUTIVE SESSION-None.**
- 6. ADDITIONAL ITEMS FROM MAYOR, COUNCIL, STAFF OR CITIZENS-None.**
- 7. ADJOURNMENT – Aldr. Turner made a motion to adjourn at 7:24 pm. Seconded By Aldr. Silkaitis. Approved unanimously by voice vote. Motion Carried 9-0.**