

**MINUTES
CITY OF ST. CHARLES, IL
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN TASK FORCE
THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 26, 2012 – 7:00 P.M.
COUNCIL CHAMBER**

Members Present: Chairman Mark Armstrong, Dr. Steven Smunt, Steve Gaugel,
Betsy Penny, John Rabchuk, Ald. Bessner

Members Absent: Brian Doyle

Also Present: Devin Lavigne, Houseal Lavigne Associates
Doug Hammel, Houseal Lavigne Associates
Russell Colby-Planning Division Manager
Rita Tungare-Community Development Director
Matthew O'Rourke- Planner

1. Call to Order

The St. Charles Comprehensive Plan Task Force meeting was called to order at 7:05 p.m. by Chairman Armstrong.

2. Approval of Minutes for May 24, 2012

A motion was made, seconded and unanimously passed by voice vote to accept the minutes of the March 1, 2012 meeting.

3. Review Comments from West Gateway & Downtown Focus Area Open House.

Mr. Lavigne said they compiled a six page summary of the feedback that was heard at the open house. He said he received a letter from Shodeen stating that there were some things listed in the feedback that were misrepresented and false. There was also an email from Tom Anderson. Both letters were distributed to the Task Force.

Chairman Armstrong said that it was the first time the Task Force were seeing the comments and asked if they would like to take a few minutes to skim through those so questions could be asked of either the consultants or of the writers of the letters, who were both present.

Mr. Lavigne suggested that all the subareas be discussed after the open house scheduled next week at one final Task Force meeting to review all comments on the subarea plans. Chairman Armstrong agreed and said maybe they could double back later that evening if time permitted. He asked staff that comments be sent directly to the Task Force so they would be ready for the next meeting. He then asked if Staff was looking for any action that evening on Mr. Anderson's and Shodeen's comments. Ms. Tungare said no because Shodeen's comments were received late in the day today. Mr. Lavigne said he spent the most time at the workshops with Shodeen and Mr. Anderson and that they are the two major property owners in the two subareas respectably. Chairman Armstrong said yes so we certainly need to work with them.

4. Review Focus Area Plans

a. East Gateway/Charlestowne Mall area

Mr. Lavigne said the commercial design guidelines produced for the West Gateway will be used for the East Gateway subarea and all other commercial properties. Additionally there will be development concepts of the mall and a plan in 3D like was done for downtown that would show and describe the plan best.

Mr. Lavigne said they identified the visions and goals for the East Gateway as a revitalized retail area to maximize the locational assets of that area of the city. He said the connectivity needs to be improved and better separation of incompatible land uses is needed. He noted issues, such as frontage roads leading to nowhere and not much activity happening on some parcels. He said there is an industrial park that extends into and impacts what could be commercial along Main St. He said the area need to be made more attractive to serve as a gateway and with it being a large area it should be comprised of mixed uses.

Mr. Rabchuk asked where the process is at in terms of the Task Force comments. Mr. Lavigne said there is an open house next week and they are under contract to meet a timeline, but he doesn't see a need to rush Task Force comments now. If the Task Force doesn't feel the plans are ready for public view then they will postpone that. Mr. Rabchuk stated he is not sure because it is the first he has seen of the plans. Mr. Colby said they were sent through email on Friday which also had a link attached to view the plans. Ms. Tungare said there is still a week before the open house for the Task Force to review the plans.

Chairman Armstrong noted the possible new street proposed on the railroad right-of-way and asked about the extent of infrastructure cost, including the significant drainage issues, and if there would be sites that are developable with an industrial use that are not developable now. Mr. Lavigne said the right of way is 100 ft. and could fit a road and a trail, and there are parcels there with limited access but that are open for development. The road would allow the diversion of the service traffic for the businesses along Main St. He said all the car dealerships could tie into the road around the back for deliveries etc.

Chairman Armstrong questioned the stretch between Tyler and Kirk, as he is not sure it would be worth the money. Mr. Lavigne said the tracks have abandoned west of Tyler and that may be an opportunity because it's industrial back there and you would not be worried about incompatible uses. He mentioned the large shallow detention basin that could be ponded as another development opportunity. Chairman Armstrong said although it's a great idea especially if Industrial Drive were connected south to add another outlet, the down side would be, other than the through street, that there is not a lot of opportunity near Kirk with all the buildings on the south side of Dukane. Mr. Lavigne said 100 ft. right of way provides the ability to have a street with 90 degree parking behind the buildings.

Mr. Rabchuk asked if in eliminating the frontage road they are looking at more curb cuts off Rt. 64. Mr. Lavigne said one curb cut between Chili's or Olive Garden to go either direction. He said the frontage road is a great idea if it exists everywhere, but that right now it just causes confusion.

Mr. Lavigne said in regard to the streetscape that it needs to be attractive because people base their perception of an area on what they see when passing through. He said the industrial park needs more trees within the rights of way and that Main St. needs a higher level of streetscaping with more decorative lighting and signage.

Chairman Armstrong said he liked the comments on landscape reduction. Mr. Lavigne said he knew it was bad on the mall property but that it is even worse on the other side. He mentioned the City taking out Ash Trees killed by Emerald Ash Borer and considerations of whether or not to replant trees. He said landscaping needs to screen unsightly areas and enhance others, not screen everything. Gaps in the sidewalks were also identified.

Mr. Lavigne said the most significant problem he sees are the street connections and the biggest one being Foxfield Rd./Dr. He proposes an east/west street through the mall site, with the Jewel access flipped, with the neighborhood to the left and the mall the right. The new street would go straight through the mall parking lot, so there is then a clean separation between commercial and residential. He said this could happen by connecting to the existing Charter One Drive. Further east, it would be ideal to go behind Walmart and carry that east to the Hilton Gardens because it would improve circulation and connectivity to the whole area.

Mr. Rabchuk asked why nothing different was indicated for Pheasant Run. Mr. Lavigne said the connection for the Hotel at Pheasant Run was talked about but was not called out as an opportunity site because they are an active hotel/resort and they are doing their own plan, but that it could be revisited. Mr. Rabchuk said we know they are struggling and in talking about the streets, there is a signal there in front and streets could someday be placed across Pheasant Run property to connect to Kautz.

Chairman Armstrong said if one day Pheasant Run is no longer around, there will only be a couple places for connections, one at Illinois Ave. and one at the light for Hilton Garden.

Mr. Gaugel said he feels the three options for the Mall and the Gateway are all excellent and very well put together. He asked if it leaves it wide open for future owners/possible buyers and if the options should be narrower. Mr. Lavigne said they would ultimately like to lean toward two options. If the site were cleared for redevelopment there would be a number of things that could be done; college campus etc. but that ultimately we would like to take out portions of it or keep big chunks of it intact; Kohl's, the Theatre and Von Maur. Chairman Armstrong said 2 of 3 plans include keeping the center area that has the carousel above it and asked if it was being kept for a large user or multi tenants. Mr. Lavigne said the mall is in great shape physically but to commit to anything a structural engineer would need to come in to let us know if big chunks of the mall could even be taken out, especially because of the anchor stores that are occupied. Chairman Armstrong said the center space is going to be tricky. Mr. Hammel said areas labeled as retail or local commercial to some extent already reflect the existing footprint and may just need a slight modification.

Chairman Armstrong said overall he liked the three plans and if he were a developer looking at these, it tells exactly what is working and not working and it shows that there are a number of plans the city is willing to look at for the site as long as the outside goals are met. Ms. Penny said it should be left open with the economy the way it is, a developer will come in with a good idea that will work. Mr. Rabchuk said it's the same as what was done with the West Gateway and he likes the framework that is used, it lays out a nice path for a developer to use and hopefully infill will not be a \$100,000,000 project, it could be \$10,000,000 here or there to start

creating that site. Mr. Hammel said rather than giving the city three different concepts, if the framework is at least established, the plan will set the context for the market to dictate what happens internally, and we can still meet the goals discussed.

Ms. Tungare asked if the three options are represented equally by the community's input. Mr. Lavigne said each of them was influenced equally. He said some input included a central park or a Main St. type shopping district where all the stores would be backed with parking. The Task Force discussed developments at Yorktown and the Arboretum in Barrington. Ms. Tungare said it will be difficult to pick two out of the three because if all three have elements of what was heard by the community, then she agrees with the group that it provides more options. Mr. Lavigne said these will be refined based on feedback. Chairman Armstrong said he doesn't feel that three options is overload but he also doesn't feel it is needed. He feels being overly specific may drive away developers.

Mr. Lavigne mentioned Foxfield Dr. and the layout which would eliminate cut through traffic. Chairman Armstrong said he likes the elimination of cut through traffic while at the same time encouraging connector streets. He like the connections up to Fox Chase, Black Hawk Trail, and King Edward, it eliminates problems of only going to one of them and by adding the houses, it buffers and has the same density and use. Mr. Rabchuk said at least as the area develops both the residents moving in and the retailers know what they are getting into.

Mr. Bessner asked in regard to the improvement plan for streetscaping and landscaping if the intention is to have them happen prior, during or following the development revitalization. Mr. Lavigne said landscape reduction could happen tomorrow. Mr. Hammel said there could be a priority list for the different areas and for the actual design of the streetscape and how it gets implemented. Mr. Rabchuk said with the Rt. 64 construction going on that things like trees or some lighting should not be replaced due to utility work. Mr. Bessner suggested maybe picking a central point to start at.

Chairman Armstrong said there are a few sites listed that are not in the city, like the Harvest Shop, and when that is ready for development it will come in. Other sites may be an advantage to move toward annexation more quickly like the farmhouse on the corner of Main & Kirk. Mr. Lavigne said that removing that building on that site is the key to repositioning that whole shopping center. Chairman Armstrong said yes but it's not annexed, nor are the railroad corridors or a small property down by Swenson Ave. Mr. Lavigne said those aren't priorities to be annexed, that would just be to clean up the map. Chairman Armstrong said but technically if electric is needed at these sites the city does not serve that, its Comed, so at least annexing in those sites would clean up the electrical lines there. Mr. Lavigne said every parcel of the city will be addressed with the land use plan that will identify what is the best use for the parcel including the unincorporated areas. Mr. Colby said he thinks what Chairman Armstrong is talking about is a more general policy regarding surrounded unincorporated property which is a city wide issue but should definitely be focused on with the City wide plans. Ms. Penny agreed that all little spots should be annexed so they can all be part of the big picture.

Mr. Colby asked if redevelopment of the Foxfield Theatre and the property surrounding is a catalyst site. Ms. Tungare said it could be if combined with the parcels around it. Chairman Armstrong said but even then it would be the last piece and there is another vacant parcel to the east and another at the north end of the church. Mr. Lavigne said the church is a corner piece of property, with a signalized intersection, across the street from a grocery store, and that it seems like a missed opportunity. He said the detention could even be shifted under the parking lot.

Public Comments

Tom Anderson said he supports trails and connections along the railroad right-of-way from Illinois Avenue to Tyler Rd.

PeterVargulich noted the majority of the residential areas proposed north of Charlestowne Mall are covering detention ponds and the water will need to be managed somehow.

b. Main Street Corridor

Mr. Hammel said this subarea plan primarily focuses on transportation and access and there are no opportunity sites identified or specific development recommendations. He said Main St. intersects with the other 3 subareas for a fair amount of the plan and he feels a vast majority of the significant redevelopment opportunities are already discussed in the subareas. He said the remaining subareas along Main St. are small infill lots which present a challenge but do not have the same catalytic opportunities as the other subareas. He said this plan looks different graphically and they felt it was very important given the nature of the recommendations to look at the actual operation and specific characteristics of the parcels; things like curb cuts etc.

Mr. Hammel said the visioning goals for this area are the same as the other subareas, and because this plan is more about access and mobility more than redevelopment that they have removed the development character elements. He said it's important to recognize that this area serves a layered function; provides access across the community and also provides site specific access to a number of uses along the way and balancing those can sometimes be a challenge. He said incremental improvements when added up can address the full corridor mobility across the city.

Mr. Bessner asked if the grade separated trail crossing will be above or below because he always felt there should be a way across but he thinks it is not possible. Chairman Armstrong said he thinks getting up high enough may be the problem. Mr. Hammel said they envisioned it as an underpass but that is could be revisited, but all aspects including access points and restrictions would need to be considered. Ms. Penny said she recalls in the past being told an underpass could not be done because of the utilities. Chairman Armstong said it was done on Prairie and there is frequent flooding there. Mr. Rabchuk said Batavia did that and their bike path is underwater on a frequent basis. Chairman Armstrong said he didn't feel there was a functional way to do an overpass. Mr. Rabchuk said it could be done on the west side on Rt. 31 because in theory in the parking lot a ramp could be built up and come across and above Vertical drop but it would take the parking away. Mr. Smunt said he would worry about a truck coming through and hitting one of the piers that is holding the bridge and that would be a disaster. He said he would rather see the bike route be designated from State on 3rd St. to bypass the river because there is a light at 3rd and Main St. and then down to Indiana and then the bike bridge back to the trail.

Mr. Lavigne said the transportation engineer they use recommended diamond cutting the concrete on Main Street to reduce noise. Ms. Penny questioned if the diamond cutting could be done now while the Rt. 64 construction is going on, especially in the downtown area.

Mr. Gaugel asked why there is a realignment needed at 7-Eleven and the carwash and what the goal for that would be. Mr. Hammel said that would be an easy one to pick off right now because of the vacant lot across the street behind the photo studio, which would be a redevelopment opportunity to then straighten out the road to the public street and get rid of the access road that runs on the west side. Chairman Armstrong said it's a small site and to have a private property

owner rebuild the intersection probably will not happen, but he likes the idea, but sees no benefit in the city putting money into it either.

Mr. Bessner asked if the intention for realigning Campton Hills Rd. and Rt. 64 was to create better cross access. He said there may be a signal needed, though he is not sure that could happen in the long run due to the new signal at Oak. Mr. Lavigne said ideally they would align and the best way to do that would be to involve somehow managing the geometry of that intersection and it should be considered when new infrastructure is installed.

Public Comments

Mr. Anderson said it shows on the map the Kabobs restaurant merging access with the property next door and he wanted to know if it's practical for that to happen. Mr. Hammel said it is not something required or that can be regulated but can be encouraged to be a partnership for better development intensity and help cut down on curb cuts, much like the Dunkin Donuts and the 7-Eleven recently did.

Mr. Anderson asked why there is a re-alignment on 17th because it is a dead end and would be a waste of money. Chairman Armstrong said he agreed.

Mr. Anderson asked what the enhanced pedestrian crossing means. Mr. Hammel said it identifies a clear crosswalk, not always meaning a flashing signal but at least a basic striping. Mr. Smunt said he is for the enhancement at 12th St. The Task Force discussed only indicating one intersection for a crossing at 11th-12th St, not two.

Mr. Anderson said 3rd St. dead ends at State St. to the railroad and he thinks it should be addressed for a future bicycle connection through this area.

5. Discussion of Corporate Reserve property

Chairman Armstrong said there are not any specific plan submissions that are being reviewed tonight for this item, but rather a discussion from a comprehensive planning perspective.

Chairman Armstrong then gave a brief history of the comprehensive planning of the property going back to the West Gateway plan. Previously there were some difficult areas to plan around, with the Nicor right of way splitting the parcels up, the old Cardinal Industries property at the west end of the railroad spur, and then the Petkus property with a large amount of uncompacted fill. He said the unknowns from that time are more or less known at this point. Back when the current plan was developed there was no Remington Glen to the west, no Regency Estates to the east, there was also not any of the retail that is currently there besides the bowling alley. The landscapes are dramatically different now.

Chairman Armstrong said there had been a development proposal on the property originally for offices and since then some buildings were built along with the road and some retail along Main St. But two parcels are left and are between two developments of medium density residential, one being Remington Glen which is 18.179 acres and around 91 units with 5 units per acre and the other being Regency Estates at 15.893 Acres and around 50 units with 3.148 units per acre. He said he did calculate the current proposal but didn't feel it was necessary to put the numbers out there because the proposal is not being looked at. Mr. Colby pointed out that the land uses that

are allowed at the Corporate Reserve site are not strictly office but also other compatible commercial uses. He referenced a list provided to the Task Force.

Mr. Colby said he thinks the City Council is looking for a general consensus from the Task Force, but that if some further analysis is warranted, then a decision does not need to be reached at this meeting.

Mr. Smunt said he is in support of the residential development over business or corporate. He said he looks at the Forest Preserve as being favorable to having residential adjacent to it and also the Great Western trail bike route that could be easily accessed eventually. He said there is residential already on each side and to put a dense commercial development between two residential uses doesn't seem to be a harmonious use. He said he supports the residential use.

Mr. Rabchuk said he feels it works as residential in some form with residential on both sides and the commercial buffer on Rt. 64 with the Forest Preserve along the back and access to the bike trail. He said agrees with Mr. Smunt.

Mr. Gaugel said he agrees residential would be possible but he wouldn't rule out some type of mixed use with office on the bottom because there are already two office building established and if it's left as residential those two office buildings would probably be vacant in the years to come.

Chairman Armstrong said he understands but asked if there needs to be more office as part of the proposal or are we willing to accept any office as part of the proposal. Ms. Penny said accept more office, but looking at other uses she agrees with Mr. Smunt.

Chairman Armstrong said in talking about a residential component, at what density range would we be looking at and would it be comparable to Regency or Remington or greater or less than.

Mr. Gaugel said he feels density comparable to both and something that would take into account those two PUDs and keep the density at a similar level as opposed to going way over, and that he doesn't feel single-family homes would serve the same purpose.

Mr. Rabchuk asked what the density of Renaux Manor is. Mr. Colby said similar to Remington. Chairman Armstrong said the only difference with Renaux Manor is all the ponds were pushed off into one location.

Chairman Armstrong asked if the Task Force wanted any additional analysis before going back to City Council, such as traffic studies etc. in order to make a reasonable informed comment on this. Ms. Penny said a traffic study would be part of anything that is proposed. Chairman Armstrong said yes always but do we need that before making a comprehensive planning decision.

Mr. Rabchuk asked if Woodward Dr. comes through to Peck. Chairman Armstrong said yes and eventually it is intended to run all the way to Randall but does not at the time, but it does go to Oak.

Mr. Lavigne said with the market implications, he thinks of something like Legacy Business Park, which he would like to see completed before a single tenant coming in and building their own campus with a building by building subdivision that could take many years to fill in.

Mr. Rabchuk said he agrees that there are much better sites that are better for office. Ms. Penny said some office is ok but that the focus should not be on office only. Mr. Rabchuk said he thinks

the density should be flexible, a little higher even, because it is somewhat isolated and it has good infrastructure already in place, with a light going in at Oak St.

Mr. Lavigne said if it were developed similar to Remington Glen that he wonders how long that would take to develop, because at least the roads and the infrastructure are already in at Remington. He said he also worries about creating competition for the adjacent developments, but that he is not particularly worried about density.

Mr. Rabchuk said he feels this site is a better site for something like AMLI which is higher density. Mr. Smunt said the eastern border closer to the office building will accommodate higher density and then west will be lower density. Mr. Rabchuk said the existing office buildings could be complimentary like veterinarian shops or bicycle shops that would support the residential or vice versa.

Chairman Armstrong said he has a different take on the competing density, he still thinks nothing will be built there until a demand is seen to complete Remington Glen and Regency Estates and he doesn't think anyone will start that with a development going up. Mr. Lavigne said it depends what kind of housing it is and he thinks if it were approved that he has to speculate that someone is interested in multi-family and is interested in doing it.

Mr. Rabchuk said not many people have 20% to put down to buy and it will be a while before that happens and a lot of people are looking to get into rental properties. He doesn't want to go back to 2006 and overbuild houses at double the rate we should have because credit was given to anybody. He said rentals should not have a stigma as substandard housing.

Chairman Armstrong said he has a lot more tolerance for letting this site sit vacant than the old Mall site or the Charlestowne redevelopment. He said in looking at significantly higher density he would want to see additional information on traffic egress and ingress and the possibility of a signal at Corporate Reserve. He said he is content at a comparable density of the 113-71 unit range. Ms. Penny asked if we say comparable are we ending up preventing another thing from being developed before it even starts. Chairman Armstrong said he doesn't think, because of the existing uses and infrastructures, that this will happen as there are about 8,000 subdivision lots in the County that are platted, approved and ready to go that are not being built on. That doesn't mean there is not enough product available, he is just not sure that this is the place to put it. He said it's not that he couldn't be convinced but he just hasn't been. Ms. Penny agrees that higher density would have more concern with traffic issues.

Chairman Armstrong said if it were something like AMLI, they would want frontage going all the way out to Rt. 64 because of the visibility. Mr. Rabchuk said he doesn't know if he agrees with that and he doesn't think it's a bad site for doing that sort of thing, even with a higher density, but that he doesn't know that it's a high priority either. Mr. Smunt said he would consider comparable or higher, give it an option, and then gather more information if need be. Mr. Lavigne said he doesn't think the proposal is very respectful of the office buildings, they area almost cauterizing them out.

Mr. Bessner asked when we start looking at parcels based on the economy and where it has been and where we may not see it go again, what type of developments are in demand. Mr. Rabchuk said the city cannot grow anymore by annexation and for vibrant retail we need population. He said none of us want to see property taxes go up. If everything stays stagnant, the retail will not

be supported, so someplace needs to be filled in with population, and he doesn't feel this site is a bad place to do it.

Mr. Lavigne said the comment that was heard most significantly by residents is "no more rentals" especially on the west side. Mr. Rabchuk said he thinks that comes from a high concentration of that sort of development, and the city is working with some of those property owners and there are ways to mitigate that, but that this site is a long way from that area. Chairman Armstrong said he wonders if it isn't too far west for the density. Mr. Rabchuk said to some degree that's up to the developer.

Mr. Gaugel asked what type of residential would not disregard the existing office buildings. Mr. Lavigne said the two driveways together have a lengthy intersection and it should be more structured as a street network, not a parking lot. Mr. Rabchuk said he doesn't think there is an easy way to realign the streets in there to make the traffic situation work. Chairman Armstrong said but it may be at the expense of some of the developable areas.

Aldr. Bill Turner said there are traffic studies available for the site and in the master proposal for the office park there is a request for a stop light at Corporate Reserves. Mr. Colby said they have a tentative approval to do that based on the office park which would have more peak traffic than the residential would, so it's possible that a traffic light is less likely with the residential, depending on the density.

Chairman Armstrong said the Task Force agrees that we are okay with the use, but not of one mind on the density, some are comfortable with matching density and some are willing to go to a higher density, not opposed to more office in the area, concerns of higher density were related to traffic and interconnections and how it related to surrounding properties. He said he doesn't know that the group could get to one mind on the density issue.

Ms. Tungare asked if it would be fair to say if there were adequate analysis done and if the site design had minimal impact with adjoining uses, the group would be comfortable with higher density. Chairman Armstrong said he "might" be comfortable and if this were for a Plan Commission review we would have a more definite answer. Ms. Penny said it is clear that we are okay with a mix of uses on the site.

6. Meeting Announcements and Project Schedule:

- a. Open House for East Gateway and Main Street Corridor Plans: Thursday, Oct. 4, 2012, 6:00pm to 7:30 pm in the Council Chambers
- b. Task Force Meeting, Wednesday, Oct. 24, 2012 at 7:00pm in the Council Chambers
- c. Task Force Meeting, Tuesday, Oct. 30, 2012 at 7:00pm in the Council Chambers

Mr. Lavigne said the purpose of the meeting on the 24th or 30th is to review a complete draft plan and he thinks the meeting on the 24th should be dedicated to finalizing the subarea plans and vision, goals, objectives. If all is finalized then the meeting on the 30th could be postponed to November.

7. Additional Business

Public Comments

Dave Patzelt asked if the West Gateway and Downtown would be discussed before one of the other scheduled meetings. Chairman Armstrong said the information will be reviewed so they will be prepared to discuss it at an upcoming meeting on either the 24th or 30th, but it will be on the agenda which is posted on the website.

Tom Anderson walked through his comments on the Downtown subarea plan, which were submitted with his email. He mentioned riverfront property being converted to green space and not part of Site A, but this is now moved across the street. He referenced the VFW property which has been for sale for a long time, which could be a double deck lot without ramps. He suggested the VFW parking could be developed for retail office upstairs, with the parking lot to the north. The north side of State St., which is currently rented, could become a development of some sort. The city is looking for more parking and when all units in downtown are occupied, all of the parking currently across from Carroll Tower will end up supporting Main St.

Mr. Anderson said in regard to the improvements for downtown, it needs to be more pedestrian friendly, more shopping and storefronts, but that Rt. 31 and Rt. 64 will never be downtown streets. He said Rt. 31 should stay open from the parking to the river.

Mr. Anderson said there is a lot of small infill space (Sites A, B, C, D, E) and he doesn't see where all the parking will go.

Chairman Armstrong asked if Mr. Anderson thinks part of the problem is because there is no barrier between the traffic and the sidewalk like on Riverside, whereas on Main St. there is, and would something like a wider sidewalk to allow planters to be a natural barrier to alleviate some of the concern. Mr. Anderson said the guideline for sidewalk says it will be 10 ft. and that is not going to happen on Rt. 31 and Rt. 64.

Mr. Anderson said all the numbers are not adding for parking and people are not going to walk far to get to the downtown area. He commented on the Harris Bank being redeveloped and there not being any parking for it until 2nd and Illinois and people will not want to walk to the river from there. He said there is a lot of infill that's going to happen with no parking. Mr. Anderson also mentioned that First St. is under parked and also that the Blue Goose lot is always full for people going to work at Fox Island Square.

Regarding Site L, Chairman Armstrong said there was an idea in the past for the church lot to build store fronts along Main St. and then taking advantage of the grade change and having one or two levels of parking above it, which would allow for fill in and address the parking at the same time and he feels that could address the issue.

Mr. Bessner said his main concern is to not give up on Main St. in providing a much more pedestrian friendly environment in the next 15-20 years. He said there is a consensus out there that it is doomed in regard to making it more friendly. Mr. Anderson said in order for that to happen there needs to be some adjustments made with the parking to make it easier for people to walk to shops on Main St.

8. Adjournment at 9:12pm.