

**MINUTES
CITY OF ST. CHARLES, IL
PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE
MONDAY, MARCH 13, 2017 7:00 P.M.**

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

Members Absent: None

Others Present: Mayor Raymond Rogina; Rita Tungare, Director of Community & Economic Development; Russell Colby, Planning Division Manager; Matthew O'Rourke, Economic Development Manager; Ellen Johnson, City Planner; Fire Chief Schelstreet; Asst. Chief Christensen

1. CALL TO ORDER

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

2. ROLL CALLED

Roll was called:

Present: Stellato, Silkaitis, Payleitner, Lemke, Turner, Bancroft, Krieger, Gaugel,
Bessner, Lewis

Absent: None.

Aldr. Payleitner asked everyone to join her in a moment of silence and reflection in respect for all involved in the tragedy that befell our city this past weekend.

3. COMMUNITY & ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

- a. Historic Commission recommendation to approve changes to the Façade Improvement Grant Program.

Mr. Colby said the Committee had discussed some potential changes to the program last year. He presented the following presentation:

Façade Improvement Grant Program- Assisted funding reinvestment in Downtown buildings over past 20+ years

- Available to Downtown commercial and multi-family residential properties
- 50% reimbursement for exterior improvements
- \$10,000 per 30 ft. building frontage
- Max. \$20,000 per building in 5 year period
- Historic Preservation Commission design review

Proposed Amendments:

- Reduce use of grants for routine maintenance
- Focus grants on projects that support Historic Preservation and Economic Development

Historic Commission recommendation:

- Consider similar program for residential properties

Commercial/Multi-Family- Changes to existing program:

- Extend eligibility to all Historic District and Landmark properties-right now the grants are only available to properties within the Central Historic Dist. (the core of downtown), or SSA 1B. There are some properties that are outside of the Central Historic District and SSA 1B, for example landmarks that might be a commercial property that can't currently apply for the grant, so this would extend the program to those properties.
- Increase minimum cost from \$1000 to \$2500 to try and encourage the program to only be utilized for projects that are going to have a significant impact and not for the smaller grants where there's not a lot of return on the investment.
- Eliminate sign-only grants (DSCP program is simpler and provides grants for signs; applicants would be encouraged to utilize their program instead of the city's Façade program).
- Change reimbursement:
 - Reduce to 25% for "routine maintenance"
 - Other improvements remain at 50%, which would be new improvements to buildings or improvements that follow historic preservation practices that are either more intensive in terms of cost or labor that's involved.

Residential Properties- New proposed program by the Historic Preservation Commission for Committees consideration

- Reward/incentivize homeowners for undertaking historic preservation projects
- For properties in Historic District or Landmark site:
 - Rated as Significant or Contributing- based on the Historic Dist. architectural survey; those rated significant or contributing could apply for the funds.
 - Non-Contributing, and will be reclassified as Contributing after improvements. For example, modifying the elements of the building that would make it qualify as non-contributing, such as removal of synthetic siding.
- \$1000 min. cost, \$5000 max. grant
- Eligible improvements limited to historic preservation appropriate projects, which are listed in the program description. "Routine maintenance" not eligible

Potential grant-eligible residential projects:

Projects with a higher cost to the property owner, but provide a benefit the community-

- Proper re-painting of historic wood siding. The thought behind the grant was to encourage Historic Pres. improvements that may be more expensive because they provide a greater benefit to the community in terms of keeping the Historic Dist. intact and keeping buildings more authentic to their original appearance.
- Reconstruct missing feature, such as a previously existing front porch
- Removal of aluminum/vinyl siding and restoration of the original siding
- Replacement with new wood windows

Budget for FY 17-18

- Commercial/Multi-Family Program: \$40,000 (same as last few years)

- New Residential Program: \$10,000
 - Pilot/test year to see how much interest there will be in the program and what type of project it attracts. It is possible that if there is a significant amount of interest they may change the requirements to make it more competitive or to target specific types of improvements, but without knowing the level of interest the Historic Commission was hesitant to place additional restrictions on it. A lot of the city's Historic Dist. properties are commercial properties, so there's not that many single family residential buildings that would qualify under the program. He said we did recently add the new Historic Dist. which adds quite a few but it's still not a large number and most properties in the district remain commercial, so there's a limited audience for those funds.

Aldr. Lewis said it's a wonderful program, she loves the we have certain historic things we want kept and requirements of people who are willing to help them go through that. Under terms and conditions #5, which states that "applications will be considered in the order they are received and in the event they have run out of money the applications will be carried over for consideration", she feels grants should be given on merit rather than first-come, first served. She's not sure she likes how the program would work as far as just because an application was submitted this year they would automatically be first in line next year so they'll get their money. Mr. Colby said in the past the program has always been set up as first-come, first served, and over the past couple years we have not had enough applicants at the beginning of the grant year for there to be any competition between them. As a result we'll maybe approve a couple of grants at the beginning of the year but won't have other applications come in until later; so we haven't been in the position to have it be a competitive program, but that is an option if that's something the Committee is interested in. Aldr. Lewis said she would not like to see that we use the money, and then someone applies this year anyway because then they'll be first next year; it should be a whole new ballgame, and once we are out of money maybe we take no more applications until we do it again.

Mayor Rogina said if this were to pass would it be rolled out on the webpage or on Facebook. Mr. Colby said yes, we would definitely need to promote the program, in particular the residential program since it's new; most property owners are familiar with the commercial program, but staff would make a renewed effort to provide publicity and attract applicants for this coming grant year. Aldr. Lewis said she would hate to see 3 people applying and there's no money left and then they're the first 3 in line next year, but maybe it's not that popular. Mr. Colby said from an administrative standpoint, that really happens in practice anyway because if someone applies for a project in a given year we are usually able to tell them before or as they are applying if funds are available, and typically they will wait until the following year anyway because they don't want to request funds until they are ready to begin construction on the project. Aldr. Lewis said perfect, that was her only concern, she didn't want a back-up where one year nobody can apply because we have leftovers from the year before.

Aldr. Turner said this program was put in for the economic viability of the downtown and he can see extending it to historic buildings that are in the downtown that are commercial in nature. He thinks a couple years ago we expanded it to other areas of the city that aren't strictly downtown. He is really not in favor of helping single-family homeowner out with their restorations; they bought it, they own it and knew what they were getting into; but yes for commercial because he really wants this money to go into economic development, not just making a neighborhood look good.

Aldr. Stellato asked if they are separate buckets; do we have \$40,000 separately set-up so the monies don't crossover, and then \$10,000 for residential, so if we run out of money in 1 we don't steal and give it to the other. Ms. Tungare said correct, they are different line items in the budget. She said to Aldr. Turner's comment; one way to view this is that one aspect of our downtown is our historic preservation, which also in some ways contributes to tourism and bringing people here; in terms of economic development benefits, preserving historical residential properties within our downtown, there's some value to doing that.

Aldr. Krieger said she believes that the history museum has "do it yourself" tours of historic buildings in town and she supports it.

Aldr. Payleitner asked if routine maintenance was covered before. Mr. Colby said yes it was covered before, as was any exterior improvements. Aldr. Payleitner said it would be identified and separated out, because she has an issue with funding routine maintenance at all, but at least this is a step in that direction.

Aldr. Lemke asked for some direction as to what might be routine maintenance on something like the Judd House where maybe the roof is deteriorating and leaking and to patch it is a hodge podge, but on the other hand you could replace the whole roof, so on one hand, one might call that routine maintenance. But on the other hand, there was a problem of the building sagging due to history and soil shifting so they put in structural steel and brick work around it, and his sense is that would be an upgrade, and what's staff's call on that. Mr. Colby said that the Historic Commission discussed some potential types of routine maintenance work which were itemized in the program description, but we recognize that it will take some interpretation for individual projects. He said what Aldr. Lemke described; one could attribute that to a maintenance issue, but the reality is we want them to make a more significant improvement, so the grant is supporting the more significant improvement to stabilize the situation, not just correct and repair. As part of the review of each grant the Historic Commission will need to go through the scope of work and identify those items, there may be some items where it's questionable if it's routine or more significant improvements. The Commission would then give a recommendation as well as the Committee. Aldr. Lemke said there was a comment from a Historic Commission member regarding an "eye sore" and encouraged the owner to replace it and he's not sure if a replacement of a historic with another historically sensitive building would be covered; he would anticipate not. Mr. Colby said that is correct.

Aldr. Stellato made a motion to approve changes to the Façade Improvement Grant Program. Seconded by Aldr. Krieger. Approved unanimously by voice vote. Motion carried. 9-0

- b. Plan Commission recommendation to approve a Revised Final Plat of Subdivision for Heritage Green.

Mr. Colby said this is a plat of resubdivision to this PUD which was approved by the Council back in 2015, the project is currently under construction and the developer is requesting to revise the subdivision plat to simply modify the building lots. The actual development plans for the project will not change in anyway; Plan Commission reviewed this application on March 7th and along with staff recommends approval.

Aldr. Lemke asked if the lots will then be entirely coterminous with the existing foundations. Mr. Colby said for the townhome buildings, yes.

Aldr Stellato made a motion to approve a Revised Final Plat of Subdivision for Heritage Green. Seconded by Aldr. Krieger. Approved unanimously by voice vote. Motion carried. 9-0

- c. Recommendation to approve a Minor Change to PUD Preliminary Plan for Parent Petroleum, Foxwood PUD, 3340 W. Main St.

Ms. Johnson said the preliminary plan for this site was first approved for construction of a bank in 2004, and then modified in 2011 when the building was converted to offices for Parent Petroleum. Dan Soltis of CIMA Developers is proposing a 1,000 sq. ft. addition to the rear of the building and part of the rear parking lot will also be modified to accommodate the addition. The design will match the existing building and foundation landscaping comparable to the existing will be provided. The proposal meets all applicable requirements of the zoning ordinance and Foxwood PUD and staff recommends approval.

Aldr. Turner made a motion to approve a Minor Change to PUD Preliminary Plan for Parent Petroleum, Foxwood PUD, 3340 W. Main St. Seconded by Aldr. Gaugel. Approved unanimously by voice vote. Motion carried. 9-0

4. ADDITIONAL BUSINESS-None.

5. EXECUTIVE SESSION-None.

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

7. ADJOURNMENT- Aldr. Gaugel made a motion to adjourn at 7:22 pm. Seconded by Aldr. Stellato. Approved unanimously by voice vote. Motion Carried. 9-0