

**MINUTES
CITY OF ST. CHARLES, IL
PLAN COMMISSION
TUESDAY, JANUARY 8, 2013**

Members Present: Todd Wallace, Chairman
 Brian Doyle
 Tom Schuetz
 Curt Henningson
 Tom Pretz
 Sue Amatangelo

Members Absent: Tim Kessler, Vice Chairman

Also Present: Matthew O'Rourke, Planner
 Russell Colby, Planning Division Manager
 Rita Tungare, Director of Community Development
 Devin Lavigne, Houseal Lavigne Associates
 Comprehensive Plan Task Force members: Chairman Mark
 Armstrong, Ed Bessner, Steve Gaugel, John Rabchuk, Betsy
 Penny

1. Call to order

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m. by Chairman Wallace.

2. Roll Call

Chairman Wallace called the roll. A quorum was present.

Mr. Armstrong introduced himself as Chairman for the Comprehensive Plan Task Force along with members; Mr. Rabchuk, Mr. Bessner, Mr. Gaugel and Mr. Doyle, who were also present. Ms. Penny joined the meeting around 7:15pm.

3. Presentation of minutes of the December 18, 2012 meeting.

A motion was made, seconded and unanimously passed by voice vote to accept the minutes of the December 18, 2012 meeting.

4. Review and Discussion of Comprehensive Plan Draft

Chairman Wallace explained that the Plan Commission is tasked by the City Council to perform certain functions and that in the unique instance of the Comprehensive Plan, tonight's public meeting, which state law requires, was being held in order to eventually make a recommendation to the City Council, where they will be holding a public hearing to consider the Comprehensive Plan. He said the draft of the plan that was before the Commission that evening would be considered and

Minutes – St. Charles Plan Commission

Tuesday, January 8, 2013

Page 2

would probably go on for several meetings. He then explained the order in which the meeting would proceed.

Vanessa Bell-Lasota-1610 Howard Street- asked if the Comprehensive Plan Task Force had been formally dissolved and if Mr. Doyle should need to recuse himself because he is a member of both the Plan Commission and the Task Force. Mr. Armstrong said the extent of the Task Force presence was only to answer questions. Ms. Tungare said the members of the Task Force were specifically representatives of some select groups and Mr. Doyle was selected as the Plan Commission representative and therefore there is no need to recuse himself as a Plan Commission member. She said the Task Force has not been officially disbanded and that would be up to the Mayor and Council's decision.

Devin Lavigne-Houseal Lavigne Associates- introduced himself and explained that his firm had been hired by the City to assist with the planning process and has been doing so for about the past 16 months.

Mr. Lavigne said that page 6 of the document highlights the purpose of the plan, which at a basic level directs orderly growth and change and is a policy guide that is intended to make sure quality life in the community remains high while providing a vision for the future based on input from residents. He said there were many opportunities for both residents and business owners to provide input into all chapters of the plan. He said the plan is used as a policy document which is not regulatory or set in stone but establishes the communities' vision for what they would like to see, so as development is brought forward, the plan should be used as a guide to see if what is being proposed is consistent with the objectives of the Comprehensive Plan. He said it does not have to match the exact specifications of the document, that is what zoning is for, and that they recommend that after the plan is adopted to make sure zoning is in-line to ensure that types of developments fostered are consistent with the plan. He said it also provides the ground rules for private development and is also a marketing tool; therefore they make sure the document is attractive, easy to read, rich in photographs and colorful illustrations to show where the City is today and where they would like to be in the next 20 years.

Mr. Lavigne said the 8 step planning process in which the community was taken through for 8 months was to get a solid understanding of existing conditions, survey land uses and transportation concerns along the corridors, things that were impacting the health, safety and welfare of the community, and things that were inconsistent with what was heard from the community. He said there was a vision workshop where residents were asked to draw out their visions; there were also workshops for Downtown and specifically the East and West Gateway, which was all entailed in the 8 step planning process through step 4, which is the existing conditions analysis; then vision for the community was established along with goals and objectives, which then helped to establish the framework for the rest of the plan and the recommendations.

Mr. Lavigne said the document itself is broken down into 11 chapters with:

- Chapter 1- Introduction-there was a detailed statistical profile prepared for the city which is on file in the existing conditions report.

Minutes – St. Charles Plan Commission

Tuesday, January 8, 2013

Page 3

- Chapter 2-Vision-is not a mission statement, but is a descriptive narrative vision statement that describes what the city will be in the next 15-20 years, and is meant to be an aspirational guide to establish framework for other recommendations.
- Chapter 3-Goals and Objectives-a goal is not something that may or may not be achieved, but the objectives beneath the goals are more strategic actionable things that can be accomplished in a budget year.
- Chapter 4-Land Use Plan-which is more than a just a map, its where the general framework for the use of land within the city and its growth areas. He said the Illinois allows a community to plan 1.5 miles outside of its incorporated boundaries, subject to boundary agreements with neighboring communities. He said Chapter 4 also contains recommendations for the use of land within the city and within the growth areas.
- Chapter 5-Community Facilities-early in the process a questionnaire was sent to every community facility provider in the community looking for any plans for expansion or new facilities online or offline, and that this plan should not dictate the community's facility provider's policy but should reflect it where appropriate.
- Chapter 6-Parks and Open Space-which does not supersede the parks district's master plan, but to make sure that the city's policy for parks and open space are in-line with the park districts.
- Chapter 7-Transportation-the plan to move vehicles and pedestrians through the city.
- Chapter 8-Subarea Plans-which are key focus area plans.
- Chapter 9-Cultured Identity Plan.
- Chapter 10-Design Guidelines.
- Chapter 11-Implementation.

Chapter 1: Introduction & Background

Mr. Doyle said in regard to the gap analysis on page 9, and also the narrative information on page 8, that he was surprised to see that the Charlestowne Mall area has a retail gap of \$200 million for motor vehicle and parts dealers because there are a lot of car dealerships on that side of town. Mr. Lavigne said it is not just car dealerships, its things like Auto Zones and Pep Boys, and that those market studies are done across the country and that is a category that consistently has a gap, and there is consistently a demand for it. He said just because there is a gap it does not mean the community needs to amend its policies to achieve the gap.

Mr. Doyle asked about the gas stations being removed from the table. Mr. Lavigne said they were removed because the sales per square foot skewed the data and that they no longer put them in the tables and that at the request of Mr. Armstrong, a definition was put in for non-store retailers. Mr. Doyle said he wonders what the implications are for the gap in non-store retailers and that it suggests to him that they are not as dynamic with foot traffic, and he is not sure what the difference is between a non-store retailer in the Downtown and Randall Rd. Mr. Lavigne said he wanted all to keep in mind that planning is not as simple as taking the table and figuring out how to make sure the land use responds to it; there is a community visioning component to the plan and the table does not seal the fate of the community. He said the table is just a demographic and market snapshot taken several months ago and the art of the planning profession is to match the market potentials with community aspirations and that he would hate for too much weight to be put into the numbers in the

Minutes – St. Charles Plan Commission

Tuesday, January 8, 2013

Page 4

table. Mr. Doyle asked what, if anything, they should infer from the table and what relation it has to the future land use map. Mr. Lavigne said a downtown area can provide an atmosphere that can't be fabricated on a commercial corridor, it provides a mixture of uses that provides an atmosphere that cannot be easily replicated in another area, so the downtown numbers in red says that you need to try that much harder to make sure downtown stays successful through marketing efforts, downtown organization, community festivals etc. Mr. Armstrong said in looking at the gap analysis on page 9, its best to compare it to the map on page 8, and the purple inner circle shows a 5 minute drive time and is what would happen if the only people that shopped in downtown lived within that circle, and the more festivals and activities to bring people in town the better off the trade areas will be. He said it works the same with the other 2 maps, Randall Rd. 15 mile drive in gold and the green is shown on the other map. He said it was observed at a previous meeting that the river is something that kind of divides the city and it skews one side from the other. This is simply to give some good starting information, but it should not be read as not having any more retailers downtown except non-store, it just means there are some obstacles there for what is wanted and we want to make sure there's either something there to draw them in or the roof tops. Mr. Lavigne said another indication on how the market analysis was responded to, there is currently a retail only overlay for downtown and in light of the current market conditions, to consider removing the restriction at least until retail is back. He said while there seems to be a surplus of retail and a strong demand for space in downtown, to have policy in place that could be restricting other uses from going in on the ground floor may be more detrimental to downtown.

Mr. Armstrong noted that the Task Force recommendation was to allow minor changes to be put in place that do not address the intent of the plan. He used the Red Gate Bridge as an example which was not present at the time of approval, but there is a bridge present now, and that those types of changes will be allowed as the plan goes on because the city is dynamic.

Chapter 2: Vision

Mr. Doyle said what struck him about this chapter was the number of times "cultural center" or "cultured place" was used and that in getting into the downtown subarea plan that they should reference back to that and think about cultural institutions, some of which may be commercial or something like the Arcada, and the use of nonprofits downtown. Mr. Lavigne said quite few times during the outreach he heard the desire for a college within the community, but that they intentionally did not specify where a college should go because there are several sites well suited for that. Mr. Doyle said if we were to infer that downtown was saturated and does not have much retail/commercial potential left then a possible ramification would be a good place to look at housing or cultural institutions that do not have that big of a tax benefit to the city, because we would be challenged to recruit those type of businesses downtown anyways, and that those are some of the impressions that come to him in looking at the gap analysis and at multiple references to cultural institutions and the possibilities downtown and what is the right mix.

Chapter 3: Goals and Objectives

Mr. Lavigne said this is a chapter that is typically updated more frequently as a community strives to tackle objectives. He said the goals are for; Residential areas, commercial and office areas,

Minutes – St. Charles Plan Commission

Tuesday, January 8, 2013

Page 5

industrial areas, transportation and circulation, infrastructure and development, community facilities, parks, open space and environmental features, image and identity, economic development and city services and administration.

Mr. Doyle asked for elaboration on the “character note approach” identified in objective 2, under goal 2 for commercial and office. Mr. Lavigne explained that it used to be that if you had a busy corridor with lots of traffic, it would be all commercial and that is not the case any longer; traffic volume does not necessarily mean commercial land use. We are starting to see other land uses going into busy corridors and that they recommend taking the key intersection and intensify them as opposed to stripping commercial along the corridors, to establish nodes of character at key intersections.

Rob Kirch-521 S. 14th St.-asked how often the goals and objectives would be monitored as far as effectiveness and reaching long term goals and which source is the data collected from. Mr. Lavigne said the source of data depends on the objective; some will be easily monitored and others will require ongoing monitoring. He said it’s recommended that city staff undertake a review of the goals and objectives. Ms. Tungare said some goals and objectives are more tangible than others and some will be more easily monitored or easily documented as to whether goals are being met or not but that monitoring will be considered on an annual basis. Mr. Lavigne noted that chapter 11, which would not be discussed that evening, the recommendation is to annually prepare a 5-year action plan to prioritize objectives and list accomplishments of the preceding years. Mr. Kirch asked how often community input would be collected and that the term “some goals are less tangible” is a concern and should all be tangible with data and numbers to support the objectives. Mr. Lavigne said some things are more subjective and is nothing that is grounded in hard data. Mr. Kirch said things should be outlined a bit more specific as to where the city is supposed to be in 15-20 years and should not use words like “appropriate” or “cooperatively”. Mr. Lavigne explained the difference between a Comprehensive Plan and Strategic Plan being that a Comprehensive Plan is a general guide, to where a Strategic Plan is more actionable, and he thinks if a Strategic Plan had language like the Comprehensive Plan then Mr. Kirchs criticism would be valid, but that this plan is just a general guide for land use and policy decisions over the next 15 years. Mr. Armstrong said the idea is not to write the specifics because that would be in the ordinance, but is to provide the direction as we want our ordinance to contain those specific things and that is why the word appropriate was chosen.

Mr. Doyle said he shares Mr. Kirch’s concerns, specifically in chapter 4-Land Use-Residential Land Use Policies, “to locate more multi-family residential development in appropriate locations and consider implications of concentrated use in one location or area of the city”. He said that will be tough to figure out what everyone thinks is appropriate and there will be some hot button issues in order for the plan to provide fair certainty to both the community and the developers as far as what can be expected when an application is brought forward, and what the plan is saying the vision and aspirations are. He said the term “incompatible” is a bit subjective and where he sees the meat being hung onto the plan are things like implementation of the land use plan, because it is the mechanism that helps provide some framework. He said in goal 3 it states that a residential design and pattern book and manual become a guideline and he assumes no such manual exists at this time. Mr. Colby said that is correct. Mr. Doyle asked when and by whom would that be developed,

Minutes – St. Charles Plan Commission

Tuesday, January 8, 2013

Page 6

because it seems like an important piece of achieving goals and objectives. Mr. Armstrong said he thought Chairman Smunt of the Historic Preservation Commission suggested that and he thinks his commission already has some base materials for the Historic District that might be applicable to expand that out. Mr. Doyle said he feels it's a very important objective and he whole heartedly supports it, but it will be difficult to agree on design guidelines. Mr. Lavigne suggested that Mr. Doyle put some stars beside that and as the city goes through its goal setting annually to say that is one you would like tackled. Mr. Tungare said that is something that was envisioned in 2006 when the new Zoning Ordinance was adopted and shortly after there was the economic downturn and were not seeing the previous issues with infill and teardowns and therefore no significant progress was made in that area, but it will be on the radar first and foremost after the plan is adopted.

Kim Malay-526 S. 16th St.-said at a previous Task Force meeting she had asked about senior and special needs housing and she feels it's an important issue that the community needs to address and she would like it addressed deeper in the goals and have it be annually or bi-annually to see what the housing needs really are so that with the issue of wanting to put in multi-family, its known if its straight out multi-family or senior housing, because some people are going to be ok with more senior housing or more special needs, and if those properties that are more appropriate can be targeted, situations may work out better. She said 55 and older developments, both affordable and higher end, are a big need in the community and in looking at Delnor and Carriage Oakes, they are successful and good neighbors and it needs to be better addressed in the goals. Mr. Lavigne noted there is a item under goal 4 that the Task Force was comfortable with.

Mr. Doyle said objective 7 under Industrial Areas is to “prevent the encouragement of businesses or land use that could impact long term viability of industrial areas”, and he feels this is one of the most important objectives in that goal and that maybe it should be moved up in order, particularly in thinking about the east side of town and cultivating those as industrial parks in the future will require that we prevent encroachment of incompatible land use. Mr. Lavigne said they are not in order of priority but they could move it up to number 1 to call attention to it. Chairman Wallace said it is never good to start an objective on a negative and to not use the word “prevent” but to use “preserving the integrity of the industrial areas through the prevention of...”.

Mr. Schuetz asked if in regard to the goals in the plan if there is any method as to where they are placed as far as looking at the recommendations. Mr. Lavigne said they try to cluster objectives but the lists are not prioritized and he thinks prioritizing 150 objectives would be a task. He said prioritizing will come with the action plans that will be prepared on an annual basis. Ms. Tungare said her preference would be to not prioritize these because the community is dynamic and things change. Mr. Lavigne said some language could be added to state that they are not in order of priority but numbered only to be able to reference the document. Mr. Armstrong said they did not prioritize them because sometimes something that might be most important and on top of the list may not go first because something lower on the list may be easiest to accomplish with current levels of funding.

Chapter 4: Land Use Plan

Minutes – St. Charles Plan Commission

Tuesday, January 8, 2013

Page 7

Mr. Lavigne said 10 distinct land use classifications were identified:

- Residential: rural single-family, single-family detached, single family attached and multi-family.
- Public/Semi-Public: Governmental and quasi-government facilities.
- Parks/Open Space.
- Commercial: neighborhood commercial, corridor/regional commercial, mixed use and industrial/business Park.

Chairman Wallace said he noticed that on page 30 for the land use map that even though there are not parcel lines included, it is interesting because he noticed that there are parcels broke out along West Main St. from about 6th St. to 14th St. and the rest of the map is more along the lines of what the future view for land use is, with the exception of that one area, and asked he why. Mr. Lavigne said it's the exception and if it were shaded orange, it would not be as obvious, but that area has a lot of activity with the school influencing land uses and that single-family would not be the best land use as it's a heavily trafficked road because all those parcels front Rt. 64. He said it is shaded for the existing uses and maybe if it were squared off more it would be less obvious. Chairman Wallace said he asks because there are several parcels over his time on Plan Commission in that area that have changed use and a guiding principal was that through the Zoning Ordinance that those parcels be developed to retain residential character but have commercial use and he wonders if the land use plan should reflect that. Mr. Lavigne said he thinks he agrees because Main St. has changed in character over the years and there's pressure for conversion to businesses and that would be a policy decision that would be consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. Mr. Armstrong said he saw the same thing Chairman Wallace did but didn't fuss about it because the parcel between 10th and 11th there is house behind it and we would not want to encourage commercial frontage on the interior streets, and west of that there is a retaining wall and he is not sure there is a lot of viability to change the plan. He said he does agree on the residential character and a text statement should be added.

Mr. Schuetz asked if some sort of transparency could be made to show future land use as opposed to the previous comprehensive plan land use. Mr. Lavigne said they could get a pdf which supports layering.

Mr. Henningson said on page 27 and the land use classifications under residential a lot of those are referenced on page 31 as well and he wonders if it would make sense to add "mixed-use" under that classification. Mr. Lavigne said on page 31 in the residential area framework, mixed use has been added to the discussion of senior housing and as it stands right now the only land use designation that is mixed use is downtown but that there is potential for the former St. Charles mall site to incorporate some mixed use as well as the Charlestowne Mall site. Mr. Henningson asked if it made sense to have mixed use in the classification on page 27 and he asks because mixed use is trend that is being heard an awfully lot of right now. Mr. Armstrong said a lot of time was spent discussing what mixed use means and it was decided for clarity to not give it multiple uses within the same plan, so there is a designation for mixed use that specifically refers to different categories together, such as commercial and residential. Mr. Lavigne said that is correct but he thinks there is a contradiction by putting mixed use under commercial designation in the list and he thinks it should be brought out of commercial and be a category in

Minutes – St. Charles Plan Commission

Tuesday, January 8, 2013

Page 8

itself, or list it twice. Mr. Henningson said he prefers to see it twice, both under residential and commercial. Ms. Tungare said it could be a stand-alone category because page 29 does a good job of defining mixed use and it might be best to make it a category on its own. Mr. Lavigne said he agrees and it would be best and the legend would be updated as well.

Mr. Henningson pointed out a typo on page 28 in the first word of the first paragraph (Foure), and also in the first sentence where it talks about the types of residential uses he thinks it should state single family attached, multi-family and to add mixed use just for consistency. Mr. Lavigne said in pulling mixed-use into its own category on page 29 it can also be stated that in addition to these 4 types of residential uses, residential land uses may also be contained within the mixed use district as described on page 29. Mr. Armstrong said there would also need to be an additional color added to the map. Mr. Lavigne said he will make it clearer.

Mr. Doyle said on page 32 and 33 are the residential land use policies and that prioritizing infill development over annexation and development, he strongly agrees, but some of these are things that will be done anyway but they are not as significant because they are somewhat obvious, for example enforcing property maintenance codes for residential properties. Mr. Lavigne said there are a lot of communities where they do not enforce that. Mr. Doyle said there would never be a policy if it said the opposite and there are some that should be there and some that are not controversial. He said some that are in the medium range are, “prioritize infill development over annexation and development”, and he feels that there needs to be an edge of town rather than just a sprawl of low level monotonous density that just spreads out consisting of towns and country and that to him is a philosophy he would like to see embraced. He said another one is, “seek opportunities to provide senior housing within the city considering locations that are in close proximity to recreation, public transit, health care and daily goods and services”. He said the most contentious one that needs discussion is, “locate new multifamily residential development in appropriate locations within the city and consider implications of concentrating units in one location or area of the city”. The explanation acknowledges residential opposition to rental development, and more recently he has heard opposition to residential development in general, particularly multi-family, medium to urban density residential development. He said it then looks back and provides somewhat of a rebuttal to that criticism and acknowledges some of the counter arguments to opposition to residential development, it then identifies a couple of catalyst sites as possibilities for mixed use, or does it. He said a comment was made earlier in regard to fair certainty that ground rules represent the community’s vision for development and the purpose of the document is to provide certainty that if a developer comes and put in an application that they have some degree of assurance that it represents what the city wants and that the community supports it. He said right now the way he reads it throughout different areas, it acknowledges those concerns but basically says there are valid reasons this should not be done and if the plan is passed as is, it’s not clear to him whether the city will know which way to go or if it will continue on the way it is. He said he has predicated Plan Commission recommendations on the plan in the past, controversial recommendations, and defended them by saying this is what our plan says to provide fair certainty and if there is ever a time to be sensitive to concerns of the community, this is the time, because once the plan is recommended to the Council and it is adopted, and it does not reflect what the community is telling us, there will be trouble.

Mr. Armstrong responded what was heard by the community at Task Force meetings was a lot of concern about concentration of multi-family in a specific area and instead it should also be interspersed throughout the city, city wide, not put all in one place. He said he didn't hear so much opposition to all apartments, all rentals, anywhere under any circumstances, but opposition to something that concentrated a specific location, and when he looks at the language in the plan, that is what he intended to come out of it, and he had requested a list of pending developments and what had approvals and it did change some of the Task Force thinking on some of the language. He said himself and Dr. Smunt at one of the open houses had a discussion on the old St. Charles Mall site and the property across the street was at least showing the possibility of putting some multi-family there rather than up against the other multi-family as well. He said he doesn't think the paragraph can be taken out of context of the rest of the plan and there is a lot of discussion about considering mitigating other impacts.

Mr. Lavigne said consistently he heard the phrase "no apartments" which is a form of ownership, not a land use, the type of land use is multi-family residential, so to have a plan that has no multi-family residential because the community doesn't want apartments would be throwing the baby out with the bath water so to speak. He said it's not counter arguing but more clarifying the point that the community's desire for no rentals is understood, but there are other types of multi-family land uses such as condominiums that could still be accommodated within the community. He said in regard to the comment of "what is appropriate locations", if it is read like that, it is taken out of context, but reading the whole paragraph, it refers you to the land use plan which identifies appropriate areas for multi-family as designated. Mr. Doyle said on page 36, mixed use is part of the land use plan outside of the downtown, basically acknowledges that downtown is the primary place identified for mixed use development but there are a number of other sites appropriate for mixed use. Mr. Lavigne said it clearly states there are two other sites, not a number of other sites. Mr. Doyle said it's no secret that he supports mixed use development and what he has heard more recently is not simply an objection to apartments, but an objection to any residential developments on the two sites and an objection to any mixed use development outside of downtown.

Ms. Malay said Mr. Armstrong covered the majority of what was heard from the community but just for more clarification, specifically the north half of the old St. Charles Mall site (Jewel site), the feedback heard was that commercial was wanted but also office or education, just not residential on that site. She said for the sake of compromise, it was admitted to that the south half (Dominick's) is up to the Commission to decide, but that the back portion of that area could have residential added to it to have that type of mixed use. She said as far as mixed use on the west side that does not get talked about is behind the Meijer where there is already approval for mixed use and that the residents are not saying do not build any residential, but that it is overwhelming and they do not want any more multi-family or townhomes, especially on the west side. She said to have a good healthy community to blend it and stop inundating the west side and make sure we are not taking good viable commercial or office property to do that because the grand picture needs to be looked at 20 years from now.

Vanessa Bell-Lasota-1610 Howard- said she is not against mixed use but for a balance of uses and looking at what the mix is in the mixed use is what is being recommended, that the balance

Minutes – St. Charles Plan Commission

Tuesday, January 8, 2013

Page 10

needs to be different being sensitive to different areas within the city which will take a little more of mix and more work and chemistry of the composition of it. Mr. Doyle asked what a good balance is. Ms. Bell-Lasota said the balance would be indicative of the area being talked and in the residential framework plan there is an area G that is on the north side of Main St. that is a potential for mixed use, so that will have different components than the old St. Charles Mall property just by what surrounds it, so certain things might be inappropriate for area G that might be appropriate for the Charlestowne Mall area. She said to recommend what the mix is, as residents they couldn't do that, but to be sensitive to the choices within the mix that come up for discussion at public hearings. Mr. Doyle said asked if Ms. Bell-Lasota is comfortable with the language and does it reflect her concerns. Ms. Bell-Lasota said she would like more injection of the words "balance of uses" on the site, not city wide, because each site is unique.

Mr. Lavigne said the land use plan designates the sites as Regional Commercial but it also states that these areas do have the potential to become mixed use, but he knows what has been heard throughout this entire process and he is 100% confident that there is not a community consensus on these sites but it does state on page 37 to continue to work with property owners and community members to finalize and acceptable development for the former St. Charles mall site, recognizing a big portion of site G. He said it will incumbent upon whoever owns the site to continue to work with the community and the residents to come up with an acceptable solution which is stated in the policy statement for the Comprehensive Plan.

Ms. Bell-Lasota said in regard to the old mall property that at one point the plan changed to high story residential and also from possible condominium/townhomes to apartments and that is a good example of reworking that balance for the neighborhood and that it wasn't against the mixed use of it but the ingredients in the balance. Mr. Lavigne said consistently he has heard no apartments; it was not that the community is opposed to multi-family, and that speaks to the balance of land uses.

Mr. Doyle said what he just heard Ms. Bell-Lasota say is very different from what he thought he had been hearing over the last couple weeks and what he is now understanding is that there may be acceptable forms of mixed use outside of the downtown area and that he also feels balance is important and the character node approach to development is what contributes to development. He said there needs to be ways to add clarification that help to delineate what is appropriate and what sort of direction is acceptable and he would like have these conversations and see if they can be added, if not part of this process, but then in the near future. He said he would like to hear from the property owner because balance entails balancing needs and the desires of different parties, but would it be reasonable to say that on these catalyst sites that a residential component shall not exceed a certain percentage.

Ms. Malay said sure, you could say 10% for the former St. Charles Mall site, but she thinks each site has to be taken on its own merits and in figuring out the Towne Centre site the question should be, what is the dream for Randall Rd., because that site and the Dominick's site are two big pieces for the corridor and if those two sites are blown then Randall Rd. is blown out of the water, but if done successfully, when developing other properties in that area there will be great success. She said we were the first ones to start developing Randall Rd. in the area and look how

Minutes – St. Charles Plan Commission

Tuesday, January 8, 2013

Page 11

far behind we are now; she said it's our choice as far as planning for that site to the best of its ability, or do we go ahead and settle and possibly wipe the future of Randall Rd., which also mean the loss of a lot of potential sales tax. She said she wants to be able to see Randall Rd. succeed and that site is critical, but putting 10%-20% residential on the far south side where there is already residential across the street is fine, but to add more apartments or more high density residential in the northern section is a no, they are done with residential in that area and there are way too many issues; it needs to be commercial, office or education, and she feels that is a good compromise from residents, but if the site is underdeveloped, in the sense of uses, we have killed it for Randall Rd. She said that property could be major high density commercial and give Geneva Commons a run for their money. Mr. Doyle said he thinks a big box store on that site would be a waste and the idea of another strip mall would be a real squandering. Ms. Malay said she agrees and you almost have to say something like the Commons, or even better a mini Oakbrook. Mr. Doyle said that's great if the property owner is willing to assume that risk and if they feel that market is there, which is why we have the market gap analysis. He said he would like to see the site be a place where people get out of their cars and they spend time there and if there is a bicycle lane down Prairie to downtown it may actually be a catalyst to get people from Randall Rd. into downtown St. Charles. He said in having this discussion he comes to realize that himself and the residents want many of the same things.

Ms. Malay said she agrees and a good point brought up is that the community fails to get discussion going between the residents and the developer right from the beginning, it doesn't happen until it gets to Plan Commission on a good day, but mostly it doesn't happen until it gets to Council, and at that point residents are already in reactive mode. To have the discussion with the developers should be a mandate to meet with the residents from the beginning. Mr. Doyle said that is what the Concept Plan stage is. Ms. Malay said by that point there are already plans and that is not sit down with them, it's more of a presentation for Commission and the Council and she feels that should be a policy that is put into the Comprehensive Plan. Mr. Armstrong recalled when he chaired the Plan Commission, the Walmart project was his last project and that those residents were every bit as vocal but there was an initial meeting at the time called a Pre-Application meeting which was designed to identify technical issues and he would attend those meetings and bring along comments from the neighbors that will need to be answered. He recommended getting a big room and inviting every single resident in the surrounding subdivision to the meeting because if the first thing they receive is a rather official looking notice from the city, they will fill in all the blanks about that plan and it will not be in the developer's favor. He said he asked what can be required and outside of a formal process at the city, there is not a lot the city can legally do and he recommended referring to legal counsel. Ms. Malay said she thought it would actually have to be put into the Zoning Ordinance. Ms. Tungare said they would have to consult with legal counsel to mandate that and there is currently something in the Zoning Ordinance that the developer meets with the neighbors for advice. Ms. Malay said she strongly encourages that and it would streamline the problems right from the beginning. Mr. Armstrong said he agrees but he is not sure it can be mandated. Mr. Lavigne said he is not sure he has ever seen a code that mandates that. Ms. Malay said she would like to have that looked at and she has also had Council member say the same and for it at least to state that it is strongly encouraged.

Minutes – St. Charles Plan Commission

Tuesday, January 8, 2013

Page 12

Chairman Wallace called for a 5 minute break returning at 9:05pm.

Chairman Wallace said his thought on this would be to finish up with this chapter and just talk a bit about the general direction for future meeting, but that does not mean this conversation cannot be revisited at future meetings. He said there is not any illusion about the thought that there will probably be a multiple number of meetings, but it will be carried on for however long it takes to cover everything. Plan Commission had no objections to that.

Ms. Malay suggested ending the meeting until the overlay that was discussed earlier is present because it would make going through the chapter easier. Chairman Wallace agreed and said that chapter 4 could be continued to the next meeting and that the next few chapters, starting with 5 all go together as a group. He said the next meeting will start with a revisit of chapter 4 hopefully with some type of overlay. He asked if there were any other comments that could not wait until next meeting.

Ms. Penny said she was nervous about the idea of putting a percentage on anything in the Comprehensive Plan because this is about looking down the road. Mr. Doyle withdrew his suggestion.

Ms. Amatangelo said in speaking about sensitivity and balance that she would like to recommend including those words in the plan because she thinks it speaks volumes. Ms. Malay said she feels that needs to go city wide as well. Mr. Lavigne said he agrees and although he does not have specific direction he knows the balance of uses is important.

Mr. Lavigne suggested that next meeting chapter 4 and 8, the subarea plans, be discussed together because that is what the community wants to discuss.

Chapter 5: Community Facilities Plan-Not discussed.

Chapter 6: Parks and Open Space Plan-Not discussed.

Chapter 7: Transportation Plan-Not discussed.

5. Meeting Announcements

Tuesday, January 22, 2013 at 7:00pm in the Century Station Training Room

Tuesday, February 5, 2013 at 7:00pm in the Council Chambers

Tuesday, February 19, 2013 at 7:00pm in the Century Station Training Room

Mr. Colby noted that the next meeting scheduled for Jan. 22 was being rescheduled to Tuesday, Jan. 29. At 7:00pm in the Council Chambers.

6. Additional Business from Plan Commission Members, Staff, or Citizens.

Mr. Prtez made a motion to continue the public meeting to January 29, 2013 in the Council Chamber. Mr. Doyle seconded the motion.

Roll Call Vote:

Minutes – St. Charles Plan Commission

Tuesday, January 8, 2013

Page 13

Ayes: Wallace, Doyle, Schuetz, Henningson, Pretz, Amatangelo

Nays:

Absent: Tim Kessler, Vice Chairman

Motion Carried.

Mr. Doyle and Mr. Schuetz noted that they would not be present for the February 19, 2013 meeting.

7. Adjournment at 9:16 p.m.