

**MINUTES  
CITY OF ST. CHARLES, IL  
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN TASK FORCE  
THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 14, 2012 – 7:00 P.M., DENS A & B**

---

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  
Rita Tungare-Community Development Director  
Russell Colby-Planning Division Manager  
Matthew O'Rourke-Planner

**1. Call to Order**

The St. Charles Comprehensive Plan Task Force meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m. by Chairman Armstrong.

**2. Approval of Minutes for October 30, 2012**

A motion was made, seconded and unanimously passed by voice vote to accept the minutes, with an abstention from Dr. Smunt, of the October 30, 2012 meeting.

**3. Task Force Review and Discussion of the Comprehensive Plan draft**

Chairman Armstrong explained that this is a draft of what has been discussed over the last number of months and that this is an opportunity to see if the draft matches with what was relayed to the consultant and to also point out any changes that need to be made before the open house. He said the draft plan would be reviewed chapter by chapter up on the screen so the public can see it and once the review is over, public comments will be received and welcomed but he encouraged the public to attend the November 28, 2012 workshop or the December 12, 2012 meeting, which would be the best time for public comments.

Chairman Armstrong said once the draft that will go to the open house is approved, it will be available on the city's website, here at the municipal building and also the public library. He noted that if anyone has trouble seeing the plans to give city staff a call.

Chapter 1-Introduction & Background

Ms. Penny said that on page 5 under past plans and studies the county's 2040 plan should be added. Chairman Armstrong agreed.

Ms. Penny said that on page 6 under Housing Market Implications it should be recast to state "affordable housing being disbursed throughout", rather than within the city, because one of the

goals was to not have affordable housing off by itself. Mr. Bessner said that he thought Mr. Doyle has previously mentioned not even using the word affordable and that he thought another word was going to be used. Mr. Gaugel said it was not so much not using the word affordable but rewording the sentence in a different context on page 30. Ms. Penny said that was fine the way it is because it is covered on page 30 under Residential Areas.

Chairman Armstrong said on page 7 regarding the Retail Gap Analysis, in the heading it states downtown is a 15 minute drive and the legend refers to a 5 minute drive and he asked if they should be identical. Mr. Lavigne said he would confirm whether the map is in correct or the title. Chairman Armstrong said it has to be 5 minutes based on the size.

Chairman Armstrong asked for clarification on page 8 under the Retail Gap Analysis profile and the red columns, which are negative numbers, and the green and black numbers being where there is less retail space. Mr. Lavigne said it's not obvious, but he thought it was in the text under the Existing Conditions Report, but that a key or a legend should probably be included. Chairman Armstrong agreed and said it needs to be more clear. He said in reading it, it tells him that the Randall Rd. retail trade gap is about \$290 million, the Charlestowne Mall gap is about \$600 million and the Downtown is over by about \$300 million and asked if that is correct. Mr. Lavigne said yes. Ms. Penny asked if there was a difference between the green and black numbers on the bottom chart. Mr. Rabhuck said the black is always potential and the green is a positive number. Chairman Armstrong said the green is what we are under in dollars and the black is how much can be absorbed. He said something has to be wrong with the numbers because this states that the city can support 230 gas stations in the Randall Rd. corridor. Mr. Lavigne said based on sales, that is what the market is saying, but obviously that would never happen. Chairman Armstrong said he doesn't want to hold things up for this but that more explanation is needed in order for it to make sense. One thing it tells him is in the total retail trade there are some good numbers as far as what is needed in what areas, but that the gas stations do not make sense. Mr. Lavigne said he thinks it is because its cost per sq. ft. and based on sq. footage gas stations generate more revenue than most businesses. Mr. Rabchuk said there has to be something wrong with the gas station number with not only the square footage number but also the dollar calculation. Mr. Lavigne said that is within a 15 minute drive time of the mall but that he would have it looked into.

Chairman Armstrong said the existing land use map on page 11 is difficult to distinguish between residential colors and in putting it up on the projector it looks even worse. Mr. Lavigne said the map looks terrible because there are parcel lines shown but that getting into the land use plan, the parcel lines are removed to look for more general places for recommendations, but that they would look into changes some of the colors.

#### Chapter 2-Community Outreach

Ms. Penny said on page 14 under Mall Development that maybe it should just say "improved" rather than "redeveloped" because it is vacant. Mr. Rabchuk said there are two elements to it, with across the street. Ms. Penny said that is true.

Ms. Penny said under Traffic and Transportation, there have been a lot of comments regarding public transportation as being important and she doesn't see it mentioned. Mr. Lavigne said this

is a summary of the initiation meeting had with this group and then there are summaries that include the community's comments. He said in talking with staff, some communities just opt to keep the comments, whether negative or critical, on file in the existing conditions report and leave the plan for more policy direction referring to the summary of outreach. He said it would thin the document out and make it a little easier to read. Ms. Tungare said all of the information from the public outreach process will remain on file because it was part of the process but that the plan itself should be the policy document and chapter 2 will be condensed considerably.

Dr. Smunt said that in the last paragraph on page 14 he thought that it was agreed that the word "character" should take the place of the word "charm". Chairman Armstrong said to the extent any of this stays in the document, he agrees that charm should not be used.

Mr. Rabchuk said he feels a lot of the comments listed here should not be used in the plan at all because it is misleading. Chairman Armstrong said it's fine to keep it for the historic purpose of seeing how we got here but that it does not to be in the final document.

Mr. Bessner said page 17, the paragraph that opens #3 talks about Charlestowne Mall but it is not listed under the bullet points as one of the top 3. Chairman Armstrong said he thinks the old St. Charles Mall Site might be referring to that. Mr. Lavigne said he thinks the intro paragraph talks about the wide variety of comments received and is just an anecdotal statement.

Ms. Penny mentioned that the Harris Bank building is no longer, it is the BMO building, and also the Chamber of Commerce is not located where it is listed, it has moved.

### Chapter 3-Vision

No comments.

### Chapter 4-Goals & Objectives

Mr. Rabchuk suggested finding a new picture for page 33 seeing as though a business shown no longer exists.

### Chapter 5-Land Use Plan

Mr. Rabchuk said on page 43 a lot of the verbiage is absolutely identical to what is on page 40. Mr. Lavigne said chapter 5, the land use plan starts out with a quick description of the intent of the different land uses. He said it's followed and supplemented by a Residential Area Framework Plan which goes into a little further description and that's why some of it is paraphrased in the introductory chapter. He said there is some repetitiveness by design to tie it back to the land use plan and then it's repeated after the residential policies. It goes to the Commercial Area Framework Plan in a similar fashion. Mr. Lavigne suggested maybe splitting them into separate chapters with chapter 6 being the Residential Area framework plan.

Mr. Gaugel asked for some clarification on page 41, under recommendations for commercial, regarding facilitation of shared parking scenarios. Chairman Armstrong said there was not a discussion regarding that but that the concept is fairly common with downtown areas where there are businesses with different peak uses, they should not all have to have their own parking

spaces. Mr. Lavigne used the example of people going to the theater using office parking because they would not be occupied at the same time periods.

Mr. Rabchuk commented that on page 49 regarding the discussion of the St. Charles Mall site that it was particularly well written and reflected a lot of what was heard as far as comments from the public.

#### Chapter 6-Community Facilities Plan

Mr. Rabchuk said on page 55 that Delnor Hospital should be changed to Cadence.

Chairman Armstrong noted that in the middle column on page 55 under County Facilities there is a paragraph on the Fairgrounds, which is not a county facility, but that an easy way to do that would be to change the headline to “additional public and semipublic facilities”. It is laid out nicely, but the county would like everyone to know they do not own the fairgrounds and vice versa. Mr. Lavigne suggested moving it to its own heading off to the right and put the photos above it. Chairman Armstrong said that’s fine as long as the distinction is made.

Chairman Armstrong said on page 56 under the Quasi-Public Facilities Legend, that the Baker Community Center should be listed under the Local Government Legend instead. He also said the post office is not Quasi-Public but he is not sure of a better place to put it under.

#### Chapter 7 – Parks & Open Space Plan

Mr. Rabchuk mentioned that the Park District Master Plan indicates that they do not like the pocket park concept at all and that he is not sure if the intent is to spur that communication. Mr. Lavigne said yes, there is a policy on page 44 to continue to work with the St. Charles Park District to ensure the residential areas of the city are well served by neighborhood parks and recreation. He said in the city code, the park dedication allows the park district to take cash in lieu of park if the park size is not considered practical. He said practical should be better defined. Mr. Rabchuk said in talking to some of the park board members, it is a cost problem for them and they consider it to be more expensive per acre than a larger park facility. Mr. Lavigne said most communities have a provision of credit for private open space and if the park district was not able to take it on, the city can still require a developer to put in a pocket park and have a home owner association take care of it and the park district would not receive the dedication or cash in lieu because it would be a private park site. Mr. Colby said the city does have a dedication ordinance with a provision to allow a private park site to satisfy the park dedication. Mr. Rabchuk said there are several examples around the city where small parks are working out extraordinarily well.

Mr. Bessner said page 60 refers to natural areas and states there are 10 of them located in the city, and he wanted to know if those will be shown on a map or listed as to what those are. Mr. Lavigne said he would take a look into that.

#### Chapter 8 – Transportation Plan

Mr. Gaugel said on page 64 there is a heading missing for the Strategic Regional Arterials, which should be there for clarification.

Mr. Lavigne said he noticed that, even though it was removed from the graphic, realigning 17<sup>th</sup> St. is listed under the network improvement, so even though the graphic is correct the text is wrong.

Chairman Armstrong said at the top of page 70 there appears to be a line between the intersection of River Grange and Foley and he is not sure what it represents. Mr. Lavigne he is not sure what it is but he doesn't think it was singled out for anything.

Mr. Rabchuk said on page 67 it shows an off street trail along one side of Main St. downtown to the Charlestowne Mall and he doesn't remember that discussion and he's not sure how that would work in the downtown area. Chairman Armstrong said he thinks that is part of the actual construction plan from IDOT.

Mr. Rabchuk asked about trying to extend the trail underneath the Main St. Bridge and said he is not sure if that is practical, but that it would be nice. Mr. Lavigne said it was agreed to move it from the Main St. Corridor Plan.

#### Chapter 9 – Subarea Plan

- West Gateway Subarea Plan

Mr. Rabchuk said he thought a discussion was had regarding having Gray/Division St. swing northward to tie into the frontage road by Binnys and not make another intersection onto Rt. 38. Mr. Colby said that is part of the annexation agreement involving Geneva and a PUD on the property for that arrangement, which is a right in/right out that turns south to intersect Rt. 38, but would be separated from the intersection at 14<sup>th</sup> St.

Mr. Lavigne said looking at page 77, site L (Valley Shopping Center) has been added based on the last discussion.

Mr. Rabchuk pointed out a typo on page 76 under the Bricher Orientation, 4<sup>th</sup> line up from the bottom; the word “needs” should not be plural.

Mr. Colby asked Mr. Lavigne to walk through the changes to the St. Charles Mall Redevelopment alternatives on page 78. Mr. Lavigne said the biggest change was the purple color in the concept legend on the top right being revised from Town Center commercial to Town Center mixed use. He said there were also some items added under the considerations including, “promote multi-family products and amenities that would foster owner occupied units”, and “allow residential uses above commercial uses, but not stand-alone multi-family buildings”.

Mr. Bessner said he thought the verbiage being used for multi-family/townhouse was being changed. Mr. Lavigne said that discussion was with Mr. Patzelt of Shodeen and Mr. Henningson of the Plan Commission, and they had the opinion that multi-family/townhome was confusing, but the Task Force agreed that they were ok with it. Chairman Armstrong said regardless of what the plan ends up with that the language, for example those definitions on page 40, should carry through the plan and should be consistent, and for the part that talks about promoting

owner occupancy, it should have more examples for the types of things wanted to be used and if that is what is really meant, it needs to be better fleshed out.

- East Gateway Subarea Plan

Mr. Rabchuk asked if the illustration on page 85 reflects the engineering requirements for stormwater retention. Mr. Lavigne said yes, that a rough rule of thumb was used and they took a look at the surface area of stormwater that exists and how much would be needed to accommodate additional units. Mr. Rabchuk said he thought the original sketches shown had suggested that there was more room for a commercial/residential development to the north of the newly aligned Foxfield Dr. instead of water retention facilities. He said on page 86 it is cut off and you cannot see it anymore. Mr. Lavigne said that in an earlier draft of the plan, due to feedback heard, they have taken away a pretty good chunk of pavement in the surface parking to reduce the detention requirements. Mr. Rabchuk said that parking lot is in pretty bad shape and he wondered if it could be reduced further if a permeable type of pavement was used. Mr. Lavigne said that is a good segue for something else that is happening right now, part of the project team is a firm called Conservation Design Forum (CDF) which specializes in sustainability. They were contracted to give this plan a “green-line audit”, which means they will go through the document in conjunction with the public open house. CDF will highlight recommendations as something that will promote sustainability. He said they will also look at opportunities to integrate green infrastructure and reduce stormwater management. He said they were especially going to take a good hard look at the East Gateway Site and that at the meeting they would provide some of the feedback from the CDF. Mr. Lavigne said he is guessing that CDF will have them remove LEAD because they have a different rating system for sustainability.

Mr. Rabchuk said he thinks there are new standards that deal with groundwater and you get points for how runoff is dealt with for the impact on the surrounding area. Ms. Tungare said the city follows the Kane County Stormwater Management Ordinance and would like to consider green technology and green practices but at this point there is not an established basis for quantifying the benefits, but hopefully it will happen soon. At this point options need to be kept open.

Chairman Armstrong said on page 85 the key should have the same changes regarding attached single-family talked about in the west side plan.

Mr. Lavigne pointed out some changes made on page 86 which included the removal of the department store anchor in option 1. He said for the middle option, most of the mall was being kept intact the way it was illustrated before; now been revised to keep the movie theatre and everything to the east but create a central park site. He said the “Main Street” Shopping District illustration is new and being seen for the first time. Ms. Tungare suggested that the illustration on page 87 have the title “Main Street Shopping District” to correspond with the option on the previous page 86. Chairman Armstrong said the illustration presumes the whole site just got really flat and he is not sure how much effort needs to be spent on something intended to illustrate a concept rather than an actual plan.

Dr. Smunt said Page 93 shows connecting bicycle routes to the downtown area and it lists a future trail, and he doesn't remember discussing the connected trails or their potential but that most of them are on busy connector streets. He said those streets are not appropriate for families and he wonders if an alternative route should be suggested at this point. Mr. Lavigne said this is the adopted trail plan but that now is the time to change it. Dr. Smunt said he is just not sure it's a good plan and the bikes need to be off the busy roads. Mr. Rabchuk said part of that is due to the traffic light connections. Chairman Armstrong said when the original plan was put together it was made sure that connections were at schools and 3<sup>rd</sup> St. was chosen because it has a very wide right of way on the south end. The idea wasn't an on street trail but possibly something wider along the edge. He said he is not sure it's still viable and he thinks Dr. Smunt's points are well taken and it should be looked at. Dr. Smunt said some input should be gathered at the open house for other viable options. He suggested Prairie St. because there is no parking allowed on the north side and an on-road bike lane could be engineered into the parking.

Mr. Rabchuk said page 95 refers to Chord On Blues which is now the River Rock House and Harris Bank also needs to be changed to BMO.

Mr. Lavigne said on page 93 the pink dots along Main St. indicate needing to make it more pedestrian friendly but that it was discussed to also make Rt. 31 more pedestrian friendly as well. He said the gray hatching signifies the downtown retail overlay district and the map was changed but the legend was not.

Chairman Armstrong said that when he looked at the retail gap analysis and he saw that there was an overabundance of retail in the downtown area, based on the existing conditions not the future development, it made him wonder if the downtown retail overlay should be revisited and to maybe tie in the gap analysis with the Downtown Improvement Plan.

Mr. Gaugel said on page 99, 100 and 101 there are excellent descriptions and asked if there is a way to incorporate those 3 pages into 2. Ms. Tungare suggested reducing the font and put it all on page 101. Mr. Lavigne said the legend could be put on every two-page spread or thin it down to just a sentence description.

#### Chapter 10 – Culture & Identity Plan

No comments.

#### Chapter 11 – Design Guidelines

Mr. Rabchuk asked from a Historic Preservation standpoint if the guidelines mentioned here are consistent with the general Historic guidelines. Dr. Smunt said they are similar, but the Historic guidelines are flexible, but more specific. The guidelines listed here are good and do not need to be any more specific. Mr. Tungare said these guidelines apply across the entire city and what may be appropriate for the Historic District may not be a good fit outside the Historic District. Dr. Smunt said the Historic District guidelines are appropriate to be used anywhere but are a lot more specific.

Mr. Rabchuk said on page 117 there is a typo under Building Materials and Colors the second sentence needs a "be" in it, to make it "should not be permitted".

## Chapter 12 – Implementation

Ms. Penny said on page 121 the word “village” should be changed to “city”.

Chairman Armstrong asked about the PILOT (payment in lieu of taxes) program on page 124 and if it is used anywhere in Illinois. Mr. Lavigne said yes, they are doing a study for one right now for Advocate Christ Hospital in Oak Lawn; it’s a tax exempt use that has a significant impact. He said they are looking to see what the financial impact is of that hospital on the village of Oak Lawn as a condition of their expansion and they are looking at payment in lieu of taxes. Chairman Armstrong said it needs to be made more clear right up front that this is not something where you can bring in your industrial building and do something instead of paying real estate taxes because that is not an option.

Mr. Gaugel said regarding the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) on page 123, that he is very familiar with this due to working at Fermilab and funds are completely out, and asked how long that will be a potential funding source. He asked if that should be something that’s a top line in potential funding sources if it has a very limited life span. Mr. Lavigne said that’s a good point and he knows there is another round of grant applications but he doesn’t think it’s a long-term funding source. Mr. Gaugel said if it is listed as a potential funding source, it should be defined by a timeframe. Mr. Lavigne said they would take a look and if there is a timetable they will put it in there.

Ms. Penny said she wonders if there should be a statement that says all potential funding sources are subject to politics because she doesn’t feel any of them are a guarantee for any length of time. Mr. Lavigne said some are being recommended that the city consider, but some of the government programs could change tomorrow and even some could be added. He said some communities remove it, but he recommends keeping it there and to add something in the first paragraph making it clearer.

Mr. Bessner said going along the same line regarding taxes and financing, he thought a discussion was had previously regarding that. Chairman Armstrong said there was, it was about TIF and different people were advocating different approaches. He said he feels we come up too favorable on TIFs here and the sentence on page 123 that states that the city “should continue to use the provision of TIF funding”, he is not sold on that and he would personally prefer to dial that back somewhat. He said he doesn’t feel TIFs are 100% evil, but some communities abuse them. Mr. Lavigne said he thinks based on the last meeting, “TIF” was replaced with “funding mechanism”, but here it is getting into specific funding mechanisms, so to remove the word “powerful” and just say a TIF is something that the city could use, rather than should.

Mr. Lavigne said a detailed implementation matrix will be added to this chapter; it is in draft form currently but can be sent out for review. Chairman Armstrong asked if it would be available for the public to review at the open house because he would hate to have the open house without it. He said he would like to have it for the public at the open house to have some public comment and the Task Force would also be reviewing it for the first time. Mr. Lavigne said it is a spread sheet and there is still a chance for the public to review it before the plan is adopted, and even the recommendations are still subject to review and comment. Ms. Tungare suggested rather than rushing into something that has not had adequate time to review, to maybe

put it on the Agenda for Dec. 12 and exclude it from the open house. Chairman Armstrong said to go ahead and do that, but it could cause a potential delay in the process, but from what it sounds like, probably not. Mr. Lavigne said it basically takes what is in Chapter 12 and puts it in grid form without changing any substance. Chairman Armstrong said he is good with that as long as there is adequate public review.

#### **4. Public Comment**

Vanessa Bell-Lasota-1610 Howard St.-said in Chapter 1 there was a paragraph regarding characterizing residents who attend meetings and key person interviews and asked what the statement “better outreach” is based on. Mr. Lavigne said this statement alone gives credence to the recommendation of pulling this chapter out because feedback is reported as it’s heard and whether it’s agreed upon or not. For transparency purposes, in the key person interviews, if one or more people made that comment, it had to be put in there. Ms. Tungare said we are not endorsing the comments and that’s why her preference is to not include them in the policy document. The key person interviews were truly confidential, it is only an opinion expressed at the interviews and not an opinion expressed in the plan itself. Ms. Bell- Lasota said “better outreach” is a whole other deeper topic and it’s a misleading statement because often times some individuals come with gathered input from residents.

Ms. Bell-Lasota made a comment regarding the residential market stating that a quarter of the housing stock is either multi-family or single-family rental in St. Charles, and there are some numbers on page 5 related to that. She wondered if the paragraph could be refined because it seems to present a lack of that housing stock.

Ms. Bell-Lasota said on page 60-parks and open spaces that she mentioned at the last meeting that she was looking for there to be a sentence to reflect the thought that in some municipal boundaries, they dove tail with the Kane County Historic property. She didn’t see anything in the former document that addressed land use and respect for those guidelines, whether it’s rustic roads or landmark properties. She mentioned that when the new bridge opens up on Red Gate, it will come out at 2 farms, one that is in the landmarking process and one that is done and she thought that was going to be wedged in somewhere. She suggested adding a paragraph where the statement about Historic properties is and say “outside the city limits or Kane County Historic properties”. Chairman Armstrong said on page 109, under Arts and Culture there is a section under Historic Preservation that might be a more appropriate place for that but it wouldn’t hurt to have it some other place as well because developers will not look at that. Mr. Lavigne said they thought about highlighting all those properties on page 46 in trying to capture the essence of the discussion and provide justification why the land use is there and any further recommendation. Mr. Rabchuk asked if there is an intergovernmental agreement between Kane County and South Elgin that there would not be any commercial activity. Mr. Colby said there is an agreement that affirms the County’s plan that is signed by both the City of St. Charles and South Elgin that has a land use plan in it that shows residential uses. Ms. Bell-Lasota asked about uses on Red Gate Road. Mr. Colby said yes, South Elgin is a party to the agreement and it extends from Crane Rd. up to Silver Glen Rd. and sets the boundary lines. Ms. Bell-Lasota asked how that makes a protective statement about land use in that area. Chairman Armstrong said it is in the county’s Comprehensive Plan. Ms. Bell-Lasota asked if there could be a reflection in the municipal document as well. Mr. Colby said it certainly could be stated but they

are trying to keep the land use map consistent with the agreement. Ms. Bell-Lasota said she strongly encourages that because this is unique in that it is the Colonel Baker farm and these are the last two farms. Mr. Lavigne said the map on 46 will include highlighted areas where there could be additional land use discussion and maybe highlight and justify why the land use is there, which could state to respect the Historic Colonel Baker farm. Ms. Bell-Lasota also suggested with its adjacency to the high school to maybe insert a photo somewhere.

Ms. Bell-Lasota said on page 125, “street wall” and “buildings having a façade with a high level of transparency” is mentioned and she didn’t know what that was. Mr. Lavigne said it’s a defining characteristic of a downtown which gives the ability to walk within an area, with store fronts as visual interest on the street, and consistent building frontage along the street. Ms. Bell-Lasota said the assets for the downtown area are the river and the horizon line, and she wonders how much the horizon line will be obliterated by the street wall. She feels a sense of enclosure is one thing and to talk about leading people to the river, but she thinks as you’re driving through town, the effect of the river will be taken away. She then asked about the height for the street wall. Mr. Lavigne said the ideal sense of enclosure is at 2 to 1 ratio at the same proportion of daylight/visible sky to building frontage. Mr. Colby said building size in the CBD-1 zoning district is regulated by building height (50 ft.) and maximum gross floor area per building. Mr. Lavigne said there was not a ratio put in because there are exceptions to every rule.

Ms. Bell-Lasota mentioned some points taken from the Urban Land Institute 2013 report, regarding revisiting multi-family. Currently developers are rushing in to multi-family, people will eventually start to move back to the suburbs, renting since you may not be able to buy, growth in apartments could tail off, and it’s hard to keep discipline and prevent over building, shifting offices into apartment space. She said according to this report, offices are actually taking an upswing because you can get financing, and seeing as though this is a 20-year document, she wants to be sure there is not an over emphasis on the promise of multi-family, when in 2014, it will level off. Chairman Armstrong asked in using multi-family, what is the distinction. Ms. Bell-Lasota said the vertical product.

Kim Malay-526 S. 16<sup>th</sup> St.-said in regard to the Historic charm/character, that historic integrity should also be used because it is very important to our downtown. She clarified that there is not any residential in plan 1 for West Gateway and plan 2 there is some residential, and plan 3 is a lot of mixed use. Mr. Lavigne said correct, and the text that was added allows residential uses above commercial uses but not stand alone multi-family. Ms. Malay said a lot of that is what the plan was before. Ms. Malay said she is concerned that at a lot of past meetings there has been a lot of comment that residential use is not wanted. Mr. Lavigne said yes, but he has also heard feedback that the community needs more units to support commercial and that there should be multi-family. Ms. Malay said the city’s own survey shows that over 83% are against apartments, 80% against townhomes, 60% against mixed use and 71% against more single-family. She said there are properties around this property that are already approved for concept plans with mixed use and multi-family units and she asked why we keep going back to this property when we should be looking at the big picture, since this is our biggest retail property on Randall Rd. and has the most potential for retail. She said doing a mixed use development on the site will be selling the town and the Randall Rd. corridor short. Mr. Lavigne said he thinks its captured best on page 49 stating that the city needs to come to resolution with the property owners and the

residents on this property. Ms. Malay asked why the majority of the residential keeps getting put in on the north half of Rt. 38 instead of over behind the old Dominick's, but definitely no more apartments in the area. If any residential, it should be townhomes because that is what's across the street on Bricher.

Arthur Lemke-3214 Blackhawk Trail-asked whether some residents want this, but the survey says no. The Comprehensive Plan should have balance and that is because the retail and commercial have the effect of absorbing tax base without sending children to the schools. He said with all the through traffic on Rt. 64, we should be using that for retail sales tax opportunity, so there is a benefit to the city, to the balance that we have historically had. He said the school districts has done studies that build out the city which shows areas that will one day be residential, but the size of the schools cannot always anticipate a huge amount of conversion of what otherwise would be contributing retail, commercial vs. residential space that sends children to schools.

Ms. Tungare asked if the task force would like to review the alternatives for the mall site. Mr. Rabchuk said the intent of the three diagrams is just an example of ways the city is willing to look at and consider to make utilization of the property. Mr. Lavigne said yes, it's more diagrammatical to break up the size of the site and the integration of open space and the development says it should happen under a PUD which would give the city more flexibility to negotiate with the developer.

Dr. Smunt asked if it would be a problem to take the brown multi-family/townhouse sections away from Prairie and the existing multi-family residential and put it along Bricher Rd. He said if that were done it would be sensitive to what the west side neighborhood association has been talking about. Mr. Lavigne said that would not be a problem and would be fine to do that and that the text should read attached single-family, not even /multi-family. Mr. Rabchuk said he thought it was discussed that multi-family had to be considered a potential. Chairman Armstrong said that is the purple areas of mixed use where there is no standalone multi-family. Mr. Rabchuk said in general he thought the concept was to have three options to show potential uses and not try to limit that. Dr. Smunt said his thought was just to reorganize the colors on the map without changing the concept and maybe the more preferred location would be along Bricher Rd. because it maintains architectural integrity with Geneva, south side of Bricher Rd.

Ms. Tungare asked if the task force would like a fourth alternate plan to reflect this. Mr. Gaugel said he thought there was already four or more and it was already pared down, but he thinks if it can be accommodated to go with three plans rather than four. Mr. Lavigne said they will try to do it in three.

Ms. Bell-Lasota said for the record, there was only one comment for the West Gateway at the open house to consider more multi-family in the area behind Jewel. She recommended changing the word "some" residents to "many" residents to be respectful for this long process. She asked if there is any reason why, in considering the comments at the open house, there can just be one with a residential component, why must there be two, because elsewhere in the plan it says to be sensitive to infill locations and that is still not sensitive to the infill location.

Dave Patzelt-17 N. 1<sup>st</sup> St.-Geneva, IL commented that in looking at the site plans, to keep in mind where the detention is, similar to what was done on the East Gateway plans. He confirmed that page 15 would be deleted from the plan but still kept on file. He said on page 19 it states that the mall site is abandoned and that means to give up control, and as the property owner they have not given up any control as of yet, and that appears again on page 21 under Economic Development. Ms. Tungare asked if those comments were verbatim and if they were, she would not tamper with what people put on their index cards. Mr. Lavigne said that text should be added to that chapter to put in that those were verbatim comments.

Joe Masiokas-23 N. 7<sup>th</sup> St.-said he is the Chairperson for the 2R2R group and there has been a long standing battle again Lexington Club PUD, and last meeting it was stated that the task force did not want to change the plan until the Lexington issue is resolved. He suggested doing something similar to what has been done with the west and east gateway and offer three alternatives. If Lexington is not in play, the residents in the area feel that if it has to be residential, it should match the density and character in the area, which would be about 80 single-family detached homes. He said what they would really like to see on the property is a project involving independent and assisted living for seniors and the disabled. Chairman Armstrong said they may do something along those lines but right now it is pending because they don't want to make a decision on land use and have the City Council finalize something while it is all still going on.

Pat Watson-318 Remington Dr.-said the Corporate Reserves site is a pending action also so why does it show residential. Mr. Lavigne said at the last meeting it was decided to leave the land use plan as what was designated and established under the approved PUD and then in the residential framework plan, highlight it as potential attached single-family residential. He said it could be highlighted with a description of what the task force said stating that they would support attached single-family residential provided it's reflective of the density adjacent to it.

Mr. Lemke said this is more of a drill down issue to Charlestowne Mall and some of the detention that has been vacated in the plan may be because of tearing up the pavement to replace it with draining-type pavement. He said the problems really have to do with residential drainage from the parcel to the north which is near Indian Way and Blackhawk Trail, where there is a large detention that drains water from the Charlemagne subdivision. He said as part of replacing a lot of collector streets and the testimony from the City Council as far as the extension of Charter One Drive, was that one street would be \$5 million. He doesn't see how the streets would be paid for.

Chairman Armstrong said before the Dec. 12 meeting, he would like to see an analysis of projects approved but not built, including residential density's, possibly mapped, annexation agreements, and PUDs.

## **5. Meeting Announcements & Project Schedule**

- Open House for the Comprehensive Plan draft, Wednesday, November 28, 2012, 6:00 to 7:30 pm in Council Chambers

- Task Force Meeting, Wednesday, December 12, 2012 at 7:00pm in Council Chambers

**6. Additional Business**

Mr. Lavigne noted that the cover of the plan online is from flicker and he doesn't think they have the right to it, but to start thinking about new cover photos and how to name the document. Chairman Armstrong said in his opinion to go with 2013 and as far as the picture, he like what is used.

**7. Adjournment at 9:16pm.**