

**MINUTES  
CITY OF ST. CHARLES, IL  
PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE  
MONDAY, AUGUST 13, 2012 7:00 P.M.**

**Members Present:** Chairman Carrignan, Ald. Stellato, Monken, Payleitner, Turner, Rogina, Martin, Krieger, Bessner, Lewis

**Members Absent:** None

**Others Present:** Mayor Donald P. DeWitte; Rita Tungare, Director of Community Development; Matthew O'Rourke, Planner; Russell Colby, Planning Division Manager; Chris Tiedt, Development Engineering Manager; Bob Vann, Building & Code Enforcement Manager

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

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

**2. ROLL CALLED**

Roll was called:

Present: Stellato, Monken, Payleitner, Turner, Carrignan, Rogina, Martin, Krieger,  
Bessner, Lewis

Absent: None

**3. COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT**

- a. Recommend approval of a Resolution declaring default and authorizing the Mayor to demand payment under a Letter of Credit-Artesian Springs Subdivision.

Mr. Tiedt said that over the past 3 years Staff has expended a significant amount of time and effort to work cooperatively with Mr. Brummel to complete the remaining improvements within the Artesian Springs Subdivision, and at this time Staff is not confident that the improvements will be completed in a timely manner. He said it is Staff's desire to secure the funding and have the City complete the public streets, storm sewer punchlists and installation of sidewalks on vacant lots, and other remaining improvement's would be completed at a later date when homes are constructed on the vacant lots. He said the currently held letter of credit is in the amount of \$80,000 issued by the State Bank of Geneva, and the estimated cost of the public improvements is approximately \$95,400. At this time Staff is seeking Council's authorization to secure the necessary funding by the resolution declaring default and demanding payment on the letter of credit to complete the work. He said Mr. Brummel had been made aware of this.

Chairman Carrignan asked if anyone was there to represent Mr. Brummel and if so would they like to say anything. There was no response.

**Aldr. Stellato made a motion to recommend approval of a Resolution declaring default and authorizing the Mayor to demand payment under a Letter of Credit-Artesian Springs Subdivision. Motion was seconded by Aldr. Monken.**

Roll Call Vote:

Ayes: Stellato, Monken, Payleitner, Turner, Rogina, Bessner, Martin, Krieger, Lewis

Nays:

Absent:

Motion Carried.

- b. Recommend approval of a Temporary Parking Lot on the Phase III Site of the First Street Redevelopment Project and an asphalt carriage walk along the east side of First Street.

Mr. Tiedt said Staff was directed to explore options to construct a temporary parking lot on the Phase 3 site of the First Street Redevelopment Project. One of the cost effective options is to install a 50-space parking lot in the area by placing compacted processed asphalt grindings, with a top seal coat. The sand seal tar emulsion that would go over the top would provide a better surface to stripe the area and keep dust down. He said additional maintenance activity such as resealing, restriping and regrading may be necessary if the parking lot remains in place for more than a year. He said in addition there would be a 5ft. asphalt carriage walk placed on the east side of First St. from Route 64 to allow pedestrian access down to the temporary parking lot. He said that Staff does not have a lot of experience with constructing a temporary parking lot in this manner but that Staff believes the temporary parking will be very cost effective.

Aldr. Bessner asked if there is a demand for this parking outside of regular events. Mr. Tiedt said he is not sure of the demand and that Staff was just asked to look at what type of parking could be placed on that site. Ms. Tungare said there is ample parking in the parking deck, but there is a demand for more convenient parking.

Aldr. Bessner asked about seeding and blanketing and if it would just be literally around the perimeter of the parking lot. Mr. Tiedt said correct it would be just the disturbed area.

Aldr. Rogina asked if the asphalt carriage walk could become permanent. Mr. Tiedt said no, it would probably only remain in place until the 1 W. Main St. property is redeveloped.

**Aldr. Stellato made a motion to Recommend approval of a Temporary Parking Lot on the Phase III Site of the First Street Redevelopment Project and an asphalt carriage walk along the east side of First Street. Motion was seconded by Aldr. Turner.**

- c. Recommend approval of a Map Amendment, Amendment to a Special Use for a Planned Unit Development, and a PUD Preliminary Plan (Corporate Reserve Multi-Family Residential Development).

Mr. O'Rourke reviewed the Staff Report dated August 1, 2012. He said the applicant modified the proposal as follows: reduction from 331 multi-family units to 317 units, 2 building along the western property line have been reduced from 3 stories to 2 stories, and an increase in the contribution to the Housing Trust Fund from \$50,000 to \$1,300,000.

Paul Robertson-JCF Real Estate-1930 N. Thoreau Dr.-Schaumburg- said 3 significant changes have been made, the 2 buildings, 6 and 8, were previously 3-story buildings with 21 units each and were 44ft. 6in. tall. The buildings have been reduced by 1 floor each to be 2 stories, with a reduction of 7 units per building, reducing units from 331 to 317. He said the revised building height for the two buildings is 33ft. 8in., which is 10ft. 10 in. shorter than they were previously. He said this was done to address two concerns: the density, and to provide less visual impact on the west side and to the neighbors at Remington Glen. He said the increase in the contribution to the Housing Trust Fund was a result of the investors coming out of pocket with another \$1.3 million that essentially gets no return, and he added that more progress has been made with their financing.

Aldr. Stellato said in regard to Zoning Ordinance Section 17.18.050 Fee-in-Lieu, there is a second caveat stating “with the construction of 24 on site units” and he asked what the variance is. Mr. O’Rourke said the Ordinance requires that a fee-in-lieu cannot be paid for more than 50% of the required units for a development of this size. He said it would basically be a full waiver of the requirement to build any onsite units and then on top of that a reduction in what would be the other 50% of the fee-in-lieu to that amount. Aldr. Stellato asked if it had been quantified at all dollar-wise with the fee-in-lieu for the elimination of the affordable units. Mr. O’Rourke said essentially it would be double the amount stated in the staff report if it were a whole fee-in-lieu, which is \$4.8 million. Aldr. Stellato clarified that the number should be \$4.8 million and that the offer is for \$1.3 million. Mr. O’Rourke said that’s correct.

Aldr. Bessner asked if there had been any discussion with the Housing Commission yet regarding the suggested fee amount. Ms. Tungare said that as part of the process they are not required to go before the Housing Commission and that staff is looking for direction from Committee as to whether they would like a courtesy review from the Housing Commission, but that in the past several months they have indicated that they are not interested in engaging in negotiations with the developer on a case by case basis. She said the next item on the agenda is proposing a revised process and an establishing criteria so the Housing Commission will not have to engage in negotiations with developers on a case by case basis, but that if Committee feels that they would like it directed back to the Housing Commission, that staff would be happy to take it through that process. Aldr. Bessner said he doesn’t want to see any precedence set legally or morally in the future.

Aldr. Krieger said she is concerned about the economic viability of the project seeing as though a letter of credit was just pulled for some construction in that area and that there are also other housing problems for the area. She asked how the financing was going and if it would be going better if the property taxes, that were due in June, were paid. Mr. Robertson said the Tracey Cross report is now public record and it does show that rent is \$1.55 a sq. ft. and absorption of 14 units a month projected for the 331 unit project, so that rent level supports financing and capitalization of the project. He said they are close to signing terms sheets with a bank that would do all on their own balance sheet and also mezzanine investors to come in with additional money. He said all capital would be provided and committed for the entire project up front.

Aldr. Rogina asked about the future competition intensifying over the next few years with other apartment complexes. Mr. Robertson said there is a strong trend right now away from owner-occupied to rent and the report clearly indicates the strength of the performance for the AMLI

project. He said he thinks this product with all its amenities will reset the bar for anyone that will come behind it. He said he is aware of the Shodeen project that's trying to get re-entitled in Mill Creek and the work being done on First St. that could be rezoned from for-sale to for-rent, and he sees those as complimentary uses and that giving renters a choice is a good thing.

Aldr. Rogina asked if the future is really all that negative in respect to offices. Mr. Robertson said there is 30,000 sq. ft. of office right now that is 100% occupied and it took 4 years to get there and at that rate there is plenty of room to get the 587,000 sq. ft. leased. He said in the proposed area of the site there is 45,000 sq. ft. that can be put up in a 3-story building and that the concept of single story has been presented also. He said on the parcel that fronts Main St. there is the ability to fit at least a 45,000 sq. ft. building there and given current demand dynamics it would be another 5-year's worth of inventory.

Aldr. Turner asked about the comparable price ranges, mainly to AMLI or Mill Creek, and if the vacancies are really at zero or 1-2%. Mr. Robertson said that is correct. Aldr. Turner said he is not worried about it being absorbed over 3-years but as far as rezoning the land and losing office space, especially west of Randall Rd., that there is an alternative on Route 38 behind Meijer's and Lowes. He said he doesn't have much of a problem with the project even after listening to the residents, and that a year ago it was proposed 244 units and it wasn't wanted then either. He said he feels the issue is not density or traffic, but do the residents really want apartments and that is something the committee will need to decide. He said he is not a big fan of the Comprehensive Plan because it depends on all the stars aligning; good microeconomics, macroeconomic, a willing developer and a willing market and that doesn't really happen and there will always be changes happening to the Comprehensive Plan. Because there is land on Rt. 38 that is comparable for office research he is willing to change on this.

Aldr. Lewis asked in regard to the traffic study and extending Woodward Dr. with a traffic signal and if any conversations with the state or the county have happened yet for that to happen. Mr. O'Rourke said the signal at Woodward and Randall is something that has been contemplated and is being looked at in a more global sense and essentially the traffic study is looking at more "if" that happens. Ms. Tungare said if that would be considered as part of the development, direction would be taken from Committee at this time.

Aldr. Rogina commented on the traffic study saying that there are issues all over the area and there are also positive things to be said about the traffic depending upon the context.

Aldr. Lewis asked if there are any other trends comparable to the RM-3 Zoning. Mr. O'Rourke said there are some RM-3 zoned properties to the south that are undeveloped on the Kane County Fairgrounds property but there has been no movement on that, but that the general trend is north of Randall is more residential and south is commercial. He said RM-3 would allow 19.8 units per acre but the developer is not proposing a development that dense and in order to change anything they would have to come back and go through the whole public hearing process again.

Aldr. Stellato said in regard to Pine Ridge Park/Regency Estates that was approved back in 2006, he asked what the zoning was on that. Mr. O'Rourke said RM-1, even with the conversion to single family. Aldr. Stellato said back in 2008 the original plan for a business park was very well received and he feels there needs to be a compelling reason as to why we would change the Comprehensive Plan and he doesn't have that reason yet. Mr. O'Rourke said Regency Estates

was zoned in the Comprehensive Plan as “Business Enterprise” so there was a decision to change the density to RM-1.

Chairman Carrignan said after city ordinances and our Strategic Plan, he feels the Comprehensive Plan is one of the most important documents within the City and it lays a foundation to look forward and a vision to shoot at, but that any good plan should allow changes.

Aldr. Rogina asked what the members of the 2008 Council that voted on this as a corporate park as part of the Comprehensive Plan think of this proposal. Chairman Carrignan said when Corporate Reserve came forward it fit the Comprehensive Plan very well and it meshed together. He said he knows the economy had changed but from a Comprehensive Plan standpoint, which is 10-20 years out, he feels that the Comprehensive Plan was right for the West Gateway to be OR and office. He said he feels it’s an issue as to whether we have the need or the want for more apartments and that he also has an issue with the inclusionary housing differential being offered which is \$4.8 million, from where it started with the developer offering \$1.3 and there still being a \$2.7 gap. He said he also has an issue with changing the Comprehensive Plan to compete with First Street, which is in the Comprehensive Plan, and he is not positive right now on the change in zoning on the Corporate Reserves.

Aldr. Payleitner said she sits on the Housing Commission and that she felt the last offer of \$50,000 was an insult and that the Inclusionary Housing Ordinance is not a recommendation for a donation, it’s an ordinance. She said she hasn’t seen any justification for the variance request. Chairman Carrignan said he doesn’t feel the city has the right to take an ordinance and selectively enforce it. He said Lexington did come forward and do something similar but that they first met with the Housing Commission and were proactive in finding another solution, but that if Lexington came in front of Committee again he would vote no because its cutting the ordinance from the way it’s supposed to be set up.

Aldr. Turner said it should all depend on the direction of the Housing Commission. Chairman Carrignan said that is not the Housing Commission’s job but it is the Council’s job.

Henry Stillwell-Attorney for the applicant-300 E. Roosevelt Rd.-Wheaton, IL-said in regard to the Inclusionary Housing Ordinance that the application was filed well in advance of the ongoing effort to review the ordinance to determine what is appropriate. He said he has not seen any draft amendments but he understands there is something on the agenda tonight. He said to look at substance relative to economic viability that at one time seemed realistic and in today’s market is nothing more than a deal killer. He encourages, in respect to the program to seriously look at that and in conjunction with working with JCF Real Estate, he has spoken with other developers who have encountered similar situations elsewhere in the Chicago Metropolitan market place where communities require 15% for affordable housing with no relief and that has simply killed the deals. He said when dealing with a rental project there is a multiplier effect because when money is taken out of the project and you reduce the rents, you determine evaluation through capitalization, it reduces the value of the project. He said there is a very big fundamental issue relative to the viability of the Ordinance currently in place. He said he hopes the Committee would recognize the duration of effort placed by the applicant as well as the Plan Commission that there could be a way to craft an ordinance addressing that issue under the PUD process because staff has made it clear to the Committee. He said guidance is needed which will then trigger a formal hearing processes that will extend over the 7 month period before Council makes

a final decision. He said he hopes they can overcome some of the other hurdles raised tonight and identify a project that will be embraced by the community and also address the affordable housing issue. He said the fundamental issue voiced this evening about the appropriateness of rezoning from office to multi-family, he would like more direction because the application was done in good faith with every expectation of achieving success, but guidance is needed. He said they have identified in the Plan Commission hearing process that there is no economic viability with respect to the extensive amount of office that has been developed for the site and it needs to be determined where the viability comes into play against long term planning for the Comprehensive Plan. He understands that, but the line is not clear and at some point they want to come back with the kind of information that is being looked for and he feels they have not given enough substance to demonstrate that departing from the Comprehensive Plan is not appropriate in this particular instance. Chairman Carrigan said we are in the middle of completely redoing the Comprehensive Plan and expect to be finished in early 2013, if this were 8-10 years ago office was the right thing to put there and fit in the Comprehensive Plan. He said he still feels office is the right thing to have there and he is very interested to understand what the new Comprehensive Plan will say about the property. He said he understands the non-viability of office and there are places in town where it was viable 20 years ago and that's why there is a Comprehensive Plan in place, to tell us what to expect and look forward to, with the ability to change it. He said since we are on the cusp of a new Comprehensive Plan he would defer to that timeline and then come back and revisit this. Mr. Stillwell mentioned that he represented the Gottlieb interest on the Remington project to the west, and his recollection was at that time was non-residential and when the project came through there was a recognition through the discussion and the presentation materials that it was appropriate to convert that area to residential. He said he doesn't think they are setting a precedent but he does understand the issues that have been raised but that it is incumbent upon the applicant to present affective testimony and evidence to support their case, it is also incumbent upon the community to give sufficient guidance and guidelines to the applicant and that is what he is looking for right now.

Aldr. Stellato said Remington Glen is owner occupied as well Regency Estates, and he gets there is no market for that right now, but it has to be answered with those different degrees. He said to make change in the Comprehensive Plan to go directly from office to high density rental, he feels that's a stretch, but maybe there is a compromise with an owner-occupied type of multifamily housing, perhaps single-family if it's possible, and that to him that makes more sense than going right to the high density rental residential. He said there really is not a market for anything right now, but the Comprehensive Plan is looking years out and to make a compromise tonight and give direction, it would need to be measured in more degrees to see if residential is ok in some form on the site. He would need to see some sort of Comprehensive Plan that laid out the entire development and maybe protected the neighbors to the west giving them a buffer. He also said back in 2008 there was 3-story parking deck proposed with a 5-story office building and those neighbors bought there knowing that was a possibility, but because it was office they were ok because there would not be traffic on the weekends. He said he is not comfortable at this point changing the Comprehensive Plan based on the information he sees today.

Mr. Stillwell said they felt this was a reasonable request because they view this as a counter to what is adjacent residentially in all directions, internally as to what it is currently zoned, and what the intensity of land use that it is already approved for and how the intensity of the use proposed relates to that. He said they are down zoning and actually reducing the intensity and the reality is the market does not support the office use and if it did the applicant would jump on

that. He said how do we find the mix that creates the diversity of the housing types that every Comprehensive Plan seeks to achieve. He said there are attached townhomes to the west and also single family residential and what is missing from the residential component in this area is the multifamily rental product. He said this rental product should not have a stigma attached to it because this is a fine quality product that has been proposed with a nice amenity package and it has been clearly identified this is the type of development which will be beneficial to the community. He said they are a little confused because they have come forward with a strong reduction in the intensity of the use that is more compatible with the current market place that provides for economic vitality, financeability and something that could be in the 20 year plan. He said they are really disappointed and they do not want to quit tonight, they want to address this effectively. Chairman Carrigan said he has no issue with the quality of the product, it's the land use and the way the inclusionary housing is structured.

Aldr. Rogina said he sees the frustration, but that this is the Committee's only opportunity to banter things around and open a forum and that is what we are doing right now. He said the citizens have already come forward and given their input which is important but not the final word. He said there have been inconsistencies said here and he thinks there needs to be a happy balance, but a good point was made in regard to competition with First Street and there is also an interest we have as a city with respect to a TIF. He said with respect to this proposal, it is now their chance to put all the pieces together, but there is an Ordinance in place and the inclusionary housing needs to be dealt with before anything.

Chairman Carrigan asked if there were a negative vote tonight, if the process would completely start over. Ms. Tungare said yes, the Council would need to ratify at City Council, and then the applicant has the choice to start the process all over again but they would have to wait 1 year. A continuance would not need to be date certain, but the public would prefer a date certain. She said the Comprehensive Plan document will be complete and in front of Council by the first quarter of 2013, and as it stands this specific property was not being looked at as part of the Comprehensive Plan because there was a development application in process. She said if the direction from the Committee is to specifically look at this property, it would be included in the Comprehensive Plan process and it would not necessarily hold up the process.

Aldr. Stellato asked if there would be some type of scheduled workshop for the community's input on this site. Ms. Tungare said there are a couple more workshops scheduled but as long as there are not several steps taken back to re-host a West Gateway workshop, which was two weeks ago. She said she believes it could be spliced into the process and keep moving forward, and there will be opportunities for public input on the property as long as there is not a long drawn hearing process on any specific property.

Aldr. Lewis asked if the property is addressed and the public input is not even for business office, will it be rezoned. Chairman Carrigan said it would remain zoned as is, the Comprehensive Plan is a guideline and a vision of where the city thinks the property should be in 5, 10 and 20 years, it's not to change anything.

Mr. Stillwell asked for a consideration from the Committee since there has been many efforts put forth by the applicant to rather than continue this to date far in the future, he would like to talk to his clients and be able to determine where they are going with this before pushing this off 8-9 months into the future, and appear before the Committee again within the next couple months.

Chairman Carrigan clarified he just did not want to have a negative vote that evening and the applicant would have to start all over again. Mr. Stillwell said he appreciates that and Sept. 10 would be preferred. Aldr. Stellato clarified the Sept. 10 date for an open process for the neighbors of the property.

**Aldr. Turner made a motion to continue the discussion to September 10. Aldr. Stellato seconded the motion.**

- d. Discussion regarding Inclusionary Housing Ordinance Amendments (Chapter 17.18 of the Zoning Ordinance).

Mr. O'Rourke reviewed the staff report dated August 1, 2012. He then showed a PowerPoint presentation explaining the background of the Housing Commission and the Inclusionary Housing Ordinance. He then explained the proposed amendments and showed the affordability snapshot and the fee-in-lieu calculation.

Ms. Tungare said in regard to the snapshot which was also presented in June, it shows the city has 18.1% affordable housing, the state mandate is 10% and 2-3 years ago we were at about 16.4%. She said the 18.1% is misleading because Cumberland Green has been included which was not included in the previous analysis but that in spite of that there has been an increasing trend in our stock of affordable housing. She asked if the Committee would be interested in considering any other amendments to the requirements for the Inclusionary Housing Ordinance, or if they would rather consider some other options, because developers are asking for waivers for deviations from the Ordinance at this time and that staff is looking for direction from Committee.

Aldr. Stellato asked about the process and if there could be some type of open forum joint meeting with the Housing Commission and the Committee, because it's not just an issue of dropping the percentage but what do we want to do with that money.

Aldr. Rogina asked how much money is in the trust at this time. Mr. O'Rourke said around \$530,000. Aldr. Rogina suggested using some of that money to improve infrastructure where the value of the land is equal to the affordable housing, or curbs and sidewalks. Mr. O'Rourke said he would need to confirm with legal counsel but he believes the Ordinance has specific eligibility requirements that the money has to be spent on, and that is state law, not just our local ordinance.

Aldr. Payleitner said the 10% is the state mandate, but there are other state expectations, and we were on a watch list because we were under 20%. Mr. O'Rourke said there is another category of below 10% but that he doesn't know if there are any implications to be on that list.

Chairman Carrigan said the issue becomes that the box is pretty hard and fast relative to the money the developer has to put in, which is 25%, so if 10% is the minimum we have and 25% puts a sunset on the Inclusionary Housing Ordinance, that it's pretty much a flat line all the way across relative to what they would pay and the cash-in lieu changes every year relative to the market. He said he thought it might be interesting to look at having a sliding scale and if 10% is the minimum make 12% the trigger point, but that as our affordable housing stock increases we

are up to 18% now and it goes out to 22%, the number of units required shrinks down on a sliding scale to 0 at 25%, and cash-in-lieu at a much higher scale and not as steep of a slope. He said we want units, not the cash and the closer we get to the goal of 25% the less units we need, the less we should be requiring, and if we start sliding back the other way we just slide back up to the 12%, not 10% to give us a little cushion.

Aldr. Payleitner said she would like to discuss boundaries, and say if Corporate Reserves passed tonight that all of the sudden our percentages would have gone from 29% to 27% and our affordable housing drops 2 percent, so she feels going to 12% doesn't seem to be enough of a cushion. Chairman Carrignan said yes but that's a pretty big development, and he doesn't see a lot space that could bring in 500 units to bring it down 3-5%. Aldr. Payleitner said right now we are high on our single-family rentals and if the market changes that will also drop so there are other factors that could drop our percentages. Mr. O'Rourke said there is no way of knowing which of the single family rentals are affordable and are all counted as market rate right now but there could be some that are affordable.

Aldr. Turner asked if it is up to the Council to decide the percentage or number of units wanted and if that is because we wrote the ordinance versus the state law. Mr. O'Rourke said that is correct, we have our own ordinance and the Council and this Committee could make the decision or refer to the Housing Commission. Aldr. Turner said he agrees with having a solid scale and get rid of all the fudge factors and that he feels we have created our own problem here because it is so nebulous to say is 1.3 good enough versus say 2.4, in the example of Corporate Reserves. Chairman Carrignan said it's the opposite because it's such a hard flat line, because it's still the same exact requirements even if we had no housing stock. Mr. O'Rourke said this is eligible to be varied through the PUD and if that doesn't exist, whether there is a sliding scale or not, you cannot ask for this kind of fudge factor because it's eliminated.

Aldr. Rogina asked if the state statute prohibits the use of funds. Mr. O'Rourke said yes if the funds are received as part of a fee-in-lieu for affordable housing and then go into a housing trust fund they have to be used for affordable housing activities, and they are very clear about that. Aldr. Rogina asked if there had been any interpretation that affordable activities might include infrastructure. Mr. O'Rourke said the state statute is pretty specific, buying land to build affordable housing on, donations to nonprofits etc.

Chairman Carrignan asked staff to coordinate a meeting for the Committee and Housing Commission to discuss the sliding scale in maybe October or November. Ms. Tungare said another option would be to invite members of the Housing Commission to the next Planning & Development meeting. Chairman Carrignan suggested putting some specific proposals on the table to discuss.

Chairman Carrignan said because of the PUD we have an escape clause, and to take that away he worries about losing that escape clause. He asked what happens if the PUD exception is taken away. Mr. O'Rourke said there was an alternative presented tonight that has a little more criteria that is based on not being able to provide affordable housing.

Chairman Carrignan asked how we ensure compliance relative to the various grants they can apply for. Mr. O'Rourke said the Housing Commission had a very lengthy conversation

regarding that as well. Chairman Carrigan said with the compliance issue on something that slides over to the voluntary side, he gets nervous about with Lexington Club.

#### **4. ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT**

- a. Recommend approval of an economic development incentive Agreement between City of St. Charles and St. Charles Chrysler Dodge Jeep, Inc. (1611 East Main Street).

Mr. Aiston said nothing had changed since the terms were presented back in May but that the purpose of the incentive program is to make for a long term commitment on the part of the Chrysler dealership to utilize property in the city that is currently vacant or underutilized as a location to run fleet dealership/sales. He said it's a good opportunity to bring money from outside of the market into the city and a good opportunity for the Al Piemonte group to enhance their existing dealership by adding around \$300,000 in improvements and purchasing two parcels of land for development purposes across the street and also the Redi-Mix parcel. He said the city will be retaining a half cent until the time it is paid back and then forever thereafter as long as the dealership is in place, the city will be keeping 100% of the sales taxes.

Aldr. Krieger said she is concerned about Tyler Rd. and Production that south of there is a driveway that was part of the old cement plant, and people are using that as a cut through to come out on Production Drive and she would like to see it either blocked or some sort of regulation set there. Mr. Aiston said according to the plan there is only one way in and out and the site will be separated into 2 different parcels, and the plan right now shows the only access would be directly off of Tyler.

**Aldr. Stellato made a motion to approve the economic development incentive Agreement between City of St. Charles and St. Charles Chrysler Dodge Jeep, Inc. (1611 East Main Street). Motion was seconded by Aldr. Monken.**

Roll Call Vote:

Ayes: Stellato, Monken, Payleitner, Turner, Rogina, Bessner, Martin, Krieger, Lewis

Nays:

Absent:

Motion Carried.

#### **5. ADDITIONAL BUSINESS**

- a. Update on the Comprehensive Plan Project-Information only.

Mr. Colby gave a brief update on the Comprehensive Plan Project.

#### **6. ADJOURNMENT-8:35 P.M.**