

July 20, 2020

Dear Commissioners ,

I read the letters from Jayme Muenz and Mony Bryant. I agree with their conclusion.

“A thorough review of the Plan as a whole makes clear that this proposal does not meet the requirements or objectives of the agreed-upon Plan for development. Therefore, it would be recommended that the Commission deny this proposal and allow the land owner to work with new developers on an alternative plan that conforms to the guidelines of the Comprehensive Plan.”

Does the City of Saint Charles have needs assessments studies? Is a gas station, car wash, convenience store, taco restaurant required for the current population? Will a new facility detrimentally effect the current St. Charles businesses?

As an eighteen year resident, the traffic at the proposed intersection is already heavy; this is an observation from a resident - not a traffic study conducted in 2017. In the morning, from northbound Kirk Road, turning right/east on to Main Street, the right turning lane could have ten+ cars waiting to turn. I passed through this intersection daily for years while traveling to work - it is already busy! Will a gas station create additional traffic on Kirk and North Avenue?

Thank you in advance for reading my concerns. My thoughts are as a resident. I share a concern for the optics of a gas station, convenience store, car wash combination projects as we enter our city. My concerns are for existing businesses being pushed aside and is there even a need for these services? My concerns are for traffic

on a road currently being used by both cars and buses transporting students to Wredling Middle School and St. Charles East High School.

Elaine Delves  
1138 Hidden Glen Circle

July 6, 2020

Attn: St. Charles City Council Plan Commission

Re: SE Corner of Kirk Rd and East Main Street – Special Use for PUD – 7/7/2020

Dear Commissioners:

Thank you for the opportunity to share my thoughts as a resident of St. Charles. I have called this beautiful city home for over 15 years, and am happy every day that my husband and I thoughtfully decided to start and raise our family here. Our first St. Charles home was in Ward 1, and we moved a few years ago to Ward 2. We have watched many changes over that 15 years to the east side, and have a commitment to ensuring the needs and image of this side of the city are not overlooked or the importance of this corridor undervalued, as many resources have been drawn toward the historic district. After recently learning of the development opportunity that has been presented for the south east corner of Kirk Road and East Main Street, I reviewed the most recent version of the Comprehensive Plan and found some inconsistencies between the proposal at hand and the guiding Plan.

This annexation affords the City and this commission the unique opportunity and ability to strategically plan this important site within our eastern corridor. It is very important to note that the property in question has never come up for sale until this proposal, and there are numerous other types of developers who would have been interested in an intersection with this level of access and visibility. That is to say, there are many other opportunities for this land use that would better meet the strategic vision and goals set forth by the City. As the site is adjacent to the near-capacity Main Street Commons shopping center, many developers will find this an attractive site when they learn of the availability of the parcel.

The Plan indicates that the purpose is to set a course to guide land use decision-making to ensure the City continues to improve upon its legacy with an eye toward the future. In the East Gateway Subarea Plan section, the intersection in question for this proposal indicates that the East Gateway of St. Charles is centered at the intersection in question today. Since moving to the area, we have seen many changes to the retail and restaurant businesses on the east side. Recent changes in occupancy of several plazas have been very positive, and leave us hopeful for a continued improvement in that arena.

The unfortunate and continued stalled reinvention of the Charlestown Mall property, combined with the closure and recent dilapidation of the Pheasant Run property, have left the gateway into our beautiful city less than ideal. As a vast majority of travelers come down Route 64 to visit, they enter through what appears to be neglect and untended property. While hopefully rectified soon, the Pheasant Run property is visibly falling apart, and the grass overgrown. The vacancy of the mall and out lots are obvious as well, even with the wonderful additions of the Starbucks and Cooper's Hawk buildings. As stated in the East Gateway Subarea Plan, a goal of the City is to keep this area economically healthy and aesthetically attractive.

It is stated in the Plan that a goal is to create, "Attractive streets and sites to distinguish the Subarea and key corridors from neighboring communities." In reviewing the proposed plan, the proposed usage would do quite the opposite. The travelers from both I-88 and I-355 pass almost a dozen gas stations and car wash establishments before reaching St. Charles. Rt. 64 and Rt. 59 have 4 car wash facilities, and 2 gas stations, alone. A gas station and car wash, accompanied by a restaurant, would be

indistinguishable from driving through West Chicago, for example. Opportunities for residents and visitors to get self and full-service car washes, and gasoline, are abundant within the City already.

I would also point out from the recent Annual Report by the St. Charles Police Department that in this same corridor at the intersection of East Main Street and Dunham Road finds ranks **number one** in the top ten intersection crash locations of 2019. It is the number 5 location of 2019's top ten roadway crash locations, tied by number of crashes with 4000 East Main Street (adjacent to the intersection in the proposal at hand), and one fewer than 3700 East Main Street (also adjacent to the intersection in this proposal at hand). This intersection also happens to have a Shell gas station, and the multiple cars entering and exiting at all times have a great impact on the safety of this intersection. It is a far less busy intersection than the parcel in question, which currently ranks 3<sup>rd</sup>, and 4<sup>th</sup> based on address on the 2019 top ten roadway crash locations in the City. Adding a high-volume of traffic entering and exiting at this intersection would be counter to the statement in the Main Street Subarea Plan of creating, "a more efficient corridor at the City-wide level." It is also counter to the statement in this section of the Plan to create, "A corridor that presents a unified image and identity for St. Charles."

A through review of the Plan as a whole makes clear that this proposal does not meet the requirements or objectives of the agreed-upon Plan for development. Therefore, it would be recommended that the Commission deny this proposal and allow the land owner to work with new developers on an alternative plan that conforms to the guidelines of the Comprehensive Plan.

Thank you for the opportunity to share my thoughts and concerns, and for your valued service to our beautiful community.

Sincerely,

Jayne Muenz

27 Southgate Course

## Johnson, Ellen

---

**To:** Sanchez, Christine  
**Subject:** RE: Plan Commission -Proposal

**From:**  
**Sent:** Monday, July 06, 2020 5:25 PM  
**To:** CD  
**Subject:** Plan Commission -Proposal

Commissioners:

I have lived in St Charles for 14 years, and my husband, 3 boys and I love where we live and are active in our community.

We have lived in Ward 2 for 9 years and have watched the many changes on the east side of town, including the demise of the mall with no real progress other than Cooper's Hawk and Starbucks.

The image of this side of the city is important, but oftentimes feels overlooked.

After learning of the development opportunity that has been presented for the south east corner of Kirk Road and East Main Street, I set out to learn more.

The Comprehensive Plan indicates that the purpose is to guide land use decision-making to ensure the city continues to improve upon its legacy with an eye toward the future.

As stated in the East Gateway Subarea Plan, a goal of the city is to keep this area economically healthy and aesthetically attractive. It is stated in the Plan that a goal is to create, "Attractive streets and sites to distinguish the Subarea and key corridors from neighboring communities." The proposed plan of a car wash and gas station would not support that statement.

How does another gas station and car wash distinguish us from West Chicago, Batavia on Kirk Rd, etc.? Visitors pass numerous gas stations and car washes before reaching St. Charles. There is not distinguishing change from one city to the next -Rt. 64 and Rt. 59 have 4 car wash facilities, and 2 gas stations just east of us.

Additionally, my neighbors and I have reviewed the recent Annual Report by the St. Charles Police Department in this same corridor as the proposal, and the intersection of East Main Street and Dunham Road ranks the **number one** in the top ten intersection crash locations of 2019. It is the number 5 location of 2019's top ten roadway crash locations, tied by number of crashes with 4000 East Main Street (adjacent to the intersection in the proposal at hand), and one fewer than 3700

East Main Street (also adjacent to the intersection in this proposal at hand). This intersection also happens to have a gas station, and the multiple cars entering and exiting at all times impact the safety of this intersection. It is a far less busy intersection than the proposed plan for the parcel in question, which currently ranks 3<sup>rd</sup>, and 4<sup>th</sup> based on address on the 2019 top ten roadway crash locations in the City. Adding a high-volume of traffic entering and exiting at this intersection would be counter to the statement in the Main Street Subarea Plan of creating, “a more efficient corridor at the City-wide level.” It is also counter to the statement in this section of the Plan to create, “A corridor that presents a unified image and identity for St. Charles.”

Our neighbors and our review of the Comprehensive plan and of the 2019 annual police report makes it clear that this proposal does not meet the requirements or objectives of the agreed-upon plan for development. We can do better. I strongly encourage the Commission to deny this proposal and ask the developer to return with alternative plan that meets the guidelines of the Comprehensive Plan and is in the best interest of development on the East side of our city.

Molly Bryant  
29 Southgate Course

Sent from my iPhone