

**MINUTES
CITY OF ST. CHARLES, IL
PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE
MONDAY, JUNE 8, 2020 7:00 P.M.**

Members Present: Stellato, Silkaitis, Payleitner, Lemke, Bancroft, Vitek, Pietryla, Bessner, Lewis

Members Absent: Turner

Others Present: Mark Koenen; City Administrator, Rita Tungare; Director of Community & Economic Development, Russell Colby; Assistant Director of Community & Economic Development, Ellen Johnson; City Planner, Rachel Hitzemann; City Planner, Ciara Miller; Econ. Dev. Planner

1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was convened by Chair Payleitner at 7:00 p.m.

2. ROLL CALLED

Roll was called:

Present: Stellato, Silkaitis, Payleitner, Lemke, Bancroft, Vitek, Pietryla, Bessner, Lewis

Absent: Turner

3. OMNIBUS VOTE - None

4. COMMUNITY & ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

- a. Presentation of a Concept Plan for Munhall Glen.

Aldr. Stellato recused himself from this item.

Court Airhart – Airhart Construction Corp. – provided background on his company and their past development projects. He presented the concept plan included in the meeting packet. The plan is for the construction of a single-family subdivision located west of S. Tyler Rd. at Munhall Ave. He felt this plan represents a great new addition to St. Charles and it meets a need for first floor master bedroom housing.

He highlighted the following items of the plan:

- 51 homes with ranch and first floor master bedroom housing
- Area amenities: access to parks, shopping and trails
- Asking for PUD to help with sizing challenges
- Neighborhood connection area consisting of bench areas with landscaping to allow neighbors to interact with one another.
- Two different lot sizes with a variety of home models.
Garden Home residences: single story to 1 ½ story homes.
Premier Home residences: same as Garden Homes with a few two-story options.

Ms. Johnson presented the Plan Commission comments/recommendations included in the Executive Summary posted in the meeting packet.

Ms. Johnson also noted the applicant requested a reduction in the School, Park and Inclusionary Housing Fees. The applicant believes the school and park populations would be more accurately estimated using the figures for attached housing, instead of detached, based on the type of product and family size that they are anticipating. Staff presented the applicant's letter of request to the school and park districts for preliminary feedback. The school district stated in the past they have not varied the population estimate for a development unless there were specific age restrictions in place. The park district responded by stating the land cash ordinance does not contain provisions for adjusting the population estimate based on the intended market. They also noted the age of residents does not necessarily decrease their need for park facilities.

Aldr. Silkaitis liked the concept and noted it was a good use of the property. He was fine with the PUD. He asked if there were going to be sidewalks. Mr. Airhart said there would be some on both sides of the street. Aldr. Silkaitis also asked if they were required to do a traffic study. Ms. Johnson said the City has the option of requesting one if the development moves forward. Aldr. Silkaitis recommended having a second entrance off of South Ave. He also said he was not in favor of changing the land/cash ordinance. He noted he has some issues with density, but felt they could work through those items.

Aldr. Bancroft felt the Plan Commission's review and comments were right in line and suggested the developer pay attention to those comments. He felt they had a nice product that would be a great addition to the neighborhood. He said he was more willing to talk about the School/Park fees than some of the other members. He is also okay with the PUD.

Aldr. Pietryla liked the development concept and was fine with the PUD. However, he would be stricter with the fees.

Aldr. Bessner said it is very nice subdivision and agreed with Aldr. Bancroft about discussing the fees. He asked if first floor ranches were making a comeback with people beyond retirees and empty-nesters. Mr. Airhart said various people are looking for high quality homes with a smaller footprint.

Aldr. Lemke felt it was a good concept and would be supportive of it. However, he would prefer a density in the 40's instead of 51. He would like to see two entrances included and he would not override the school & park fees. He also suggested the developer address the Plan Commission concerns.

Aldr. Vitek agreed with Aldrs. Bessner and Bancroft on the fees.

Aldr. Lewis felt the homes would probably be desirable for many people. She had a few reservations, but felt they could be worked out. She was not in favor of changing the land cash fees; she would like to know what surrounding businesses might think about having residences so near. She also supports two entrances. She mentioned the ranch homes across from Mt. St. Mary Park weren't selling. She asked if they build as there is demand. Mr. Airhart noted the project would take about 3-5 years to build. He said 12 out of their last 20 homes built in the last year have been first-floor master bedroom homes. He believes there is a market for this product.

Chair Payleitner read two letters that were received from residents expressing concerns about this concept plan. These concerns included trees between neighboring subdivision, detention basins, density and parking.

Mr. Airhart said they will have the opportunity to save some trees, but they haven't done any final calculations on detention basins since this is just a concept plan. They also still need to do a density study for the neighborhood to the south. As for parking, he said these are public streets so there is street parking available. However, their garage setbacks allow for an additional two parking spaces in the driveway.

The owner of a neighboring historic home called in to ask the builder to work with them to protect their home. Mr. Airhart said they always want to talk to neighbors and they added a larger lot because of this home.

Aldr. Lewis asked who will be responsible for the improvements on South Ave. Ms. Johnson said the developer is typically responsible for paying for offsite improvements.

Chair Payleitner said she has an issue with the impact fees and noted its part of the cost of doing business in the City. She is a strong proponent of affordable housing and may have an issue with lessening any of those fees.

- b. Plan Commission recommendation to approve a Minor Subdivision-Final Plat for 1734 Riverside Subdivision (1734 Riverside Ave.)

Ms. Johnson presented the Executive Summary posted in the meeting packet. She noted the plan for Lot 2 is to sell the property to a developer for the construction of a single-family home. However, an alternative option would be to offer it for use by an affordable housing developer through the Kane County Affordable Housing Fund. She is seeking feedback on this option.

Aldr. Bessner made a motion to approve a Minor Subdivision-Final Plat for 1734 Riverside Subdivision (1734 Riverside Ave.) Seconded by Aldr. Pietryla. Approved unanimously by voice vote. Motion Carried.

The Committee members were in support of using Lot 2 as an affordable housing option and directed staff to take the next steps.

- c. Plan Commission recommendation to approve a Land Banked Parking Request for BEMA Inc., 3620 Ohio Ave.

Ms. Johnson presented the Executive Summary posted in the meeting packet.

Aldr. Bancroft made a motion to approve a Land Banked Parking Request for BEMA Inc., 3620 Ohio Ave. Seconded by Aldr. Silkaitis. Approved unanimously by voice vote. Motion Carried.

- d. Historic Preservation Commission recommendation to approve a Façade Improvement Grant for 316 Cedar St.

Ms. Hitzemann presented the Executive Summary posted in the meeting packet.

Lance Ramella, applicant, said they incorporated the suggestions made by the Historic Preservation Commission regarding the East elevation and this should qualify this elevation for funding also.

Aldr. Pietryla said he favors the incentives the City has in place, but he thought there was a halt made to these expenditures. Ms. Tungare said it is still pending final Council approval on June 15th, but the reduction is already represented in this request.

Aldr. Silkaitis said the program was intended for façade improvements, but not additions. He would support the Historic Commission's recommendation.

Aldr. Lewis said she would be in favor of doing a small part, but noted it would not be financially responsible to give out grants when they are looking at reducing the budget.

Aldr. Bessner made a motion to approve a Façade Improvement Grant for 316 Cedar St. in the amount of \$18,833 (per the Historic Preservation Commission recommendation). Seconded by Aldr. Pietryla.

Roll was called:

Ayes: Bancroft, Pietryla, Bessner, Stellato, Silkaitis, Lemke

Absent: Turner, Vitek

Recused:

Nays: Lewis

Motion passed 6-1

Aldr. Vitek left the meeting.

- e. Recommendation to approve a Commercial Corridor and Downtown Business Economic Incentive Award for 316 Cedar St.

Ms. Miller presented the Executive Summary posted in the meeting packet. She clarified the status of the grant program and noted the proposed updates have not yet been reviewed or approved by the City Council so they are continuing to use the guidelines/requirements of the existing CCDI program. It does not affect eligibility for this property.

Chair Payleitner asked if the numbers would be affected based on the June 15th vote. Ms. Tungare said they would not be because they would still have \$35,000 available for the fiscal year pending Council approval. The amount was already reduced by \$15,000.

Aldr. Bancroft made a motion to approve a Commercial Corridor and Downtown Business Economic Incentive Award for \$25,000 for 316 Cedar St. Seconded by Aldr. Pietryla.

Roll was called:

Ayes: Bancroft, Pietryla, Bessner, Lewis, Stellato, Silkaitis, Lemke

Absent: Turner, Vitek

Recused:

Nays:

Motion passed 7-0

- f. Recommendation to Issue a Request for Proposals for the former Police Station site and adjacent City-owned properties.

Mr. Colby presented the Executive Summary posted in the meeting packet.

Aldr. Bessner noted the demolition would not happen at this time due to budgetary needs and asked how that would be addressed in the RFP. Mr. Colby said a proposal would need to include the demolition work, so the developer could include that in their proposal; or they could use it to negotiate an incentive for the project.

Aldr. Bancroft expressed concerns about going out with this in July due to the current environment. He felt it was a mistake and suggested waiting until spring of next year. He felt it would allow things to settle down.

Aldr. Silkaitis referred to the concept plan presentation earlier in the meeting and asked Aldr. Bancroft if there was a difference between residential and commercial. Aldr. Bancroft said the developer knows it is going to take time to work with the City and since it was a concept plan, it was not that expensive for him to do. He said it will take him about 6-12 months to get started.

Aldr. Stellato said the packet was very well done. He agreed with Aldr. Bancroft and would like to take a look at it again in about 60-90 days. He felt it wasn't the right time for the product they are going after.

Aldr. Lemke would like to add a longer timeframe, but his fear is it might get stale. He suggested opening it up at a later time when the economy shows improvement.

Aldr. Lewis said she agrees with waiting, but asked if they would need to tweak anything if they waited. The Committee did not think there would be a need.

Ms. Tungare said she felt comfortable bringing it back to the Committee in the spring. Aldr. Bancroft said it's 99.9% done so if they get a feel that things have changed, they can launch it earlier.

5. ADDITIONAL BUSINESS

Mark Koenen and Mayor Rogina recognized Ms. Tungare for her 20 years of service to the City.

6. EXECUTIVE SESSION - None

7. ADDITIONAL ITEMS FROM MAYOR, COUNCIL, STAFF OR CITIZENS-None.

8. ADJOURNMENT - Aldr. Bessner made a motion to adjourn at 8:26 p.m. Seconded by Aldr. Pietryla. Approved unanimously by voice vote. Motion Carried.