

**MINUTES
CITY OF ST. CHARLES, IL
PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE
MONDAY, MARCH 14, 2011 7:00 P.M.**

Members Present: Chairman Stellato, Ald. Penny, Krieger, Turner, Martin, Bessner, McGuirk, Monken, Carrigan, Lewis

Members Absent: None

Others Present: Mayor Donald P. DeWitte; Brian Townsend, City Administrator; Bob Vann, Building and Code Enforcement Manager; Rita Tungare, Director of Community Development; Chris Tiedt, Development Engineering Services Manager; Fire Chief Mullen; Matt O'Rourke, Planner; Russell Colby, Planner; Plan Commission Chairman Todd Wallace; Historic Preservation Chairman Steven Smunt

1. Call to order by Chairman Stellato

2. Regency Estates (Town & Country Homes)(K. Hovnanian T&C at Illinois LLC)

Application for an Amendment to Special Use Ordinance 2006-Z-4 to allow single family homes and setback variances.

Application for PUD Preliminary Plan

- PUD Preliminary Plans revised 2/16/11 and received 2/16/11
- PUD Final Engineering Plans revised 2/16/11 and received 2/17/11
- Landscape Plan revised 2/16/11 and received 2/16/11

Application for Final Plat

- Final Plat of Resubdivision dated 2/16/11 and received 2/17/11

Mr. O'Rourke reviewed the staff report dated 3/4/11 and the history of the application. He said staff recommended approval and advised that the Plan Commission made a recommendation for denial of this project.

Mr. Ray Blankenship, Town & Country Homes, presented a power point presentation discussing the original plan and the proposed site plan designed per the present economic market situation. He noted the average lot sizes and changes to the square footage with modifications to the buffer and landscaped areas. He said no variations are requested for water services, as individual services will be installed at every home. The Park District is accepting the center parcel of land in lieu of fee to construct a small pocket park. The School District has agreed to have impact fees paid when certificate of occupancy is issued. Mr. Blankenship referred to "key lots" which staff identified as corner lots, or lots more visible on the rear side. Additional architectural detail such as shutters, siding material, etc. will be included to add more appeal, along with trees and shrubs placed in those areas. He said design concepts are still being considered for the architectural

elevations for the 2000 sq. ft., 2400 sq. ft., 2700 sq ft., and 3000 sq. ft. homes. Staff requested that elements of the existing townhome structure be incorporated into the design concepts. Mr. Blankenship advised that packages will be offered for customers to add full brick, details over the windows, upgraded garage doors, shutters, gable details, arches, full porches, etc.

Ald. Bessner asked for information on the sidewalk configuration that exists and if any additions are planned, or if there is a need to have sidewalks along the flag lot private roads. Mr. Blankenship said a sidewalk around the interior perimeter of the lots is planned but currently no sidewalk exists along the exterior, perimeter, or flag lots. He said the Park District asked to have sidewalks provided in the open space area so people can enter the park site. Ald. Bessner asked if there was a plan to connect the sidewalk to the path along Woodward Drive. Mr. Blankenship noted the sidewalk along the side of Lot 41 would connect to the bike path. Ald. Bessner asked if provisions for the flag lots have been worked out to provide services for garbage, mail, fire, and police. His concern is if monitoring will be required to make sure those roads are not obstructed. Mr. Blankenship stated the Fire and Police Departments are okay with the private roads for Lots 47, 49, and 50. He said the Fire Department requested no parking signs be posted. They are working on how the garbage company and post office will provide services. Ald. Bessner asked who will be responsible to monitor the no- parking regulation. Mr. Blankenship said Town & Country will act on behalf of the association and monitor, and expects the Police Department would also monitor. He said the association would have the right to send letters and impose a fine. Ms. Tungare advised that the City does not typically enforce a parking requirement on private roads. Ald. Bessner said it appears vague as to who will enforce this and how, and his concern is an emergency vehicle being able to access these areas.

Ald. Lewis said she favors bikeable/walkable communities and this plan does not appear to offer that without a sidewalk along the perimeter. She also has concern regarding trash service for Lot 13 with having to transport trash back and forth from another lot. She said this may be an issue for all three flag lots and therefore she may not support this plan. Mr. Blankenship noted the road width is 18 feet and able to accommodate a garbage truck. Ald. Lewis agreed a garbage truck could enter the street; however will not back up.

Ald. Penny recalled problems the Council has encountered with private streets. She said residents call the City to solve issues wanting them to be treated as public streets. She noted that when associations do not become active the City is contacted to enforce but unable to help. Ald. Penny said aside from the private streets, she is favorable to this plan.

Ald. Krieger asked if a turn-around could be accommodated at the end of the flag lots. Mr. Blankenship said that had been looked at but the space is too tight. He said Lots 49 and 50 have more space but there is a significant drop-off into the wetland area.

Ald. Turner said he lives on a cul-de-sac with an 18-ft drive for four-unit buildings and emergency vehicles (two fire trucks and an ambulance) have been able to get access to

the area, even with a parked car. He said the garbage carts are brought down to the end of the drive area without any problems or complaints.

Ald. McGuirk said that if the Fire Department has given their approval and the issues regarding garbage service can be resolved this would address his concerns. He noted the changes requested from the Committee had been addressed, especially regarding concerns with the manifold system. He believes this promotes economic development and wants this to move forward. Mr. Blankenship assured that these problems will need to be solved prior to the sale of the first home.

Ald. Carrignan asked staff for information regarding the property to the east. Mr. O'Rourke indicated that is stormwater/wetland area. Ald. Carrignan asked if architectural elevations will be reviewed again by Committee since this is a PUD. Mr. O'Rourke said the elevations reviewed by this Committee will become part of an Exhibit attached to the ordinance and he explained there are design guidelines within the PUD ordinance. Ms. Tungare added that typically architectural elevations are not approved for single-family homes, but agreed this ordinance will have guidelines in place. Ald. Carrignan encouraged that a variety of plants are incorporated into the landscape plans.

Chairman Stellato asked if there were any questions for the chairman of the Plan Commission, Todd Wallace. Ald. Carrignan asked for clarification as to why the Plan Commission recommended denial for this application. Chairman Wallace said the primary concerns of the Plan Commission were the layout of the development. He explained that during the public hearing process it was suggested that flag lots be eliminated. At the last meeting it was determined that the only reason flag lots were being planned was because of the cost associated with modifying the existing utilities. A question was asked if this cost was for the developer or the City to bear, and the answer was that it was the developer's expense. The thought of the Plan Commission was that the Commission could not recommend approval for a layout that could be improved. The Commission thought those issues created movement problems within the development and the density was not appropriate for single-family housing, however would support townhomes. Prior to voting on the resolution there was discussion if the Plan Commission members would approve an alternate plan including both multi-dwelling buildings and single-family homes within the development, even though this kind of plan had not been brought before the Commission. There was unanimous favor for that type of development. He acknowledged that the existing townhome structure was not part of the application and a potential problem for the developer, however there was no attempt to integrate the plan around the existing structure. Ald. Turner recalled discussion in 2005 regarding development along Woodward Drive for 2-story buildings with commercial on the lower level and affordable housing on the 2nd level to allow residential use to move forward. He said he would be voting in favor of this petition due to the topography of the site, surrounding property, and that the original plan for residential development was approved.

Ald. Lewis asked for clarification regarding ownership of the existing townhome. Mr. Blankenship advised the townhome, as well as this property, is owned and maintained by the bank. He said the end unit of the townhome development is approximately 4,000 sq. ft. and the price has been lowered to \$600,000. He said a few townhomes within St.

Charles last year sold for over \$300,000, but the bulk 70% of units sold under \$250,000. He said St. Charles is a high-end market but townhomes prices are depressed and difficult to sell at a higher price.

Ald. Turner made a motion to recommend approval of the Regency Estates application for Special Use, PUD Preliminary Plans, and Final Plat. Mr. McGuirk seconded the motion.

Ayes: Monken, Penny, Carrignan, McGuirk, Turner, Martin, Krieger, Bessner.
Nays: Lewis
Absent: None
Motion Carried.

3. Discussion Regarding Nonconforming Signs –Amortization Extension

Ald. McGuirk excused himself from discussion.

Ald. Penny made a motion for approval and it was seconded by Ald. Monken.

Ayes: Monken, Penny, Carrignan, Turner, Martin, Krieger, Bessner, Lewis
Nays: None
Abstained: McGuirk
Absent: None
Motion Carried.

4. Application for General Amendment (City of St. Charles)

Application for General Amendment pertaining to Chapter 17.12 “Residential Districts” pertaining to Exterior Sideyard setback regulations

Mr. Colby reviewed the staff report dated 3/2/11.

Chairman Stellato said this amendment was initiated in his neighborhood. A resident wanted to add a third bay to their garage and were denied the permit even though they lived on a corner lot and have the room, but did not meet the requirements of the side yard setback by five feet. Chairman Stellato said this gives flexibility and consistency community wide.

A motion was made, seconded, and passed by unanimous vote to approve the General Amendment pertaining to Chapter 17.12 “Residential Districts” pertaining to exterior sideyard setback regulations.

5. Corridor Improvement Grant – Majestic Oaks Subdivision Entrance

Mr. O’Rourke reviewed the grant request not exceeding \$5,000.00 and stated the Corridor Commission and staff recommends approval.

Ald. Carrignan asked if this is out of the 2010/11 budget. Mr. O’Rourke said it would be from the current fiscal year 2010/11 budget.

Ald. McGuirk asked if the ordinance stipulated that grants were to be available for commercial properties only. Mr. O'Rourke explained the requirements are strictly for frontage property along Kirk Road, Main Street, and/or Randall Road but does not stipulate commercial property only. He noted that this is the second residential property to request a CIC grant and also a non-profit (St. John Neuman Church) received a grant.

A motion was made, seconded, and passed by unanimous vote to approve the CIC Grant for Majestic Oaks Subdivision.

6. Historic Preservation Residential Design Guidelines

Mr. Colby summarized how the Historic Preservation Commission has worked to develop design guidelines for residential properties in Historic Districts and residential properties designated as Historic Landmarks.

Ald. Carrigan complimented the staff and Historic Commission stating this has been significant work and gives outstanding guidelines and direction within the Historic District. Ald. Penny agreed and said this now clearly states what the City expects and desires.

A motion was made, seconded, and passed by unanimous vote to approve the Historic Preservation Residential Design Guidelines.

7. Additional Business

The meeting adjourned at 7:42p.m.