

	<b>PLAN COMMISSION AGENDA ITEM EXECUTIVE SUMMARY</b>			
	<b>Project Title/ Address:</b>	Comprehensive Plan		
	<b>Presenters:</b>	Devin Lavigne, Houseal Lavigne Associates Russell Colby, Planning Division Manager		
<b>Please check appropriate box (x)</b>				
	<b>PUBLIC HEARING</b>		<b>MEETING</b> 2/5/13	<b>X</b>
<b>APPLICATIONS UNDER CONSIDERATION:</b>				
N/A				
<b>ATTACHMENTS AND SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS:</b>				
Plan Commission Discussion Points Table		Comprehensive Plan Draft – December 2012		
<b>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:</b>				
<p>The following chapters of the draft Comprehensive Plan will be discussed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Chapter 4: Land Use Plan</li> <li>▪ Chapter 5: Community Facilities Plan</li> <li>▪ Chapter 6: Parks &amp; Open Space Plan</li> <li>▪ Chapter 7: Transportation Plan</li> <li>▪ Chapter 8: Sub Area Plans</li> <li>▪ Chapter 9: Culture &amp; Identity Plan</li> <li>▪ Chapter 10: Design Guidelines</li> <li>▪ Chapter 11: Implementation</li> </ul> <p>The Comprehensive Plan document is posted on the project website, under the “Documents” tab.  <a href="http://www.hlplanning.com/stcharles">www.hlplanning.com/stcharles</a></p> <p>The following information will be posted here on 2/4/13:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Updated table of discussion points from the 1/8/13 and 1/29/13 meetings.</li> <li>• List of items submitted by Plan Commission members for discussion at the meeting.</li> </ul> <p>Should the Plan Commission conclude discussion of the plan at this meeting, the plan draft will be listed on the agenda for a recommendation at the following meeting.</p> <p>The Plan Commission recommendation along with the Task Force draft will then be forwarded to the Planning and Development Committee for review.</p>				
<b>RECOMMENDATION / SUGGESTED ACTION</b> ( <i>briefly explain</i> ):				
Discuss the Comprehensive Plan draft.				

**Comprehensive Plan****Plan Commission Discussion Points 1/8/13 – 1/29/13**

<b>1/8/13</b>			
	<b>Chapter/Page/ Topic</b>	<b>Comment/Question</b>	<b>Response/Follow Up/Discussion</b>
1.	Chapter 2, Vision, Page 16 Commission Comment  Cultural Center in Downtown	“Cultural center” or “cultured place” was used regarding downtown, references to cultural institutions, like the Arcada and nonprofits. Comment that if downtown is saturated with retail/commercial, then it is a good place to look at housing or cultural institutions that do not have that big of a tax benefit to the city.	
2.	Chapter 3, Goals and Objectives Public Comment  Monitoring goals and objectives	Question about how goals/objectives are monitored, over what timeframe, based on what data, concern about objectives not being tangible and using terms like “appropriate” or cooperatively.”	Source of data depends on the objective; some are tangible and can be easily documented on an annual basis. Others are subjective and not grounded in data. Comprehensive Plan is a general guide, not actionable like a Strategic Plan. Goals and Objectives will be revisited annually. Specifics will be determined when a recommendation is put into the Zoning Ordinance, for example.
3.	Chapter 3, Goals and Objectives Residential Goal 3 Commission Comment  Residential Design and Pattern Book	Question- Will this book be a guideline? Comment- Concern that it will be difficult to agree on guidelines. Very important objective.	No book currently exists. Historic Preservation Commission has developed some base materials that may be applicable elsewhere. Book was envisioned with 2006 Zoning Ordinance but was not pursued as teardown/infill activity slowed. Would likely be a priority after plan is adopted.
4.	Chapter 3, Goals and Objectives, Page 18 Public Comment  Senior and special need housing	Comment that senior and special needs housing is an important issue to be added deeper in the goals. Annually or bi-annually verify housing needs to determine demand for senior housing vs. other multi-family. Senior housing projects have been successful and are good neighbors.	Goal 4 addresses this topic. Goals/Objectives are not specific about location or periodic assessment of housing needs.

5.	Chapter 3, Goals and Objectives, Page 20 Commission comment  Ordering/phrasing of objectives	Comment- "Prevent the encouragement of businesses or land use that could impact long term viability of industrial areas", is important, maybe it should be moved up in order.  Related comment- do not start an objective on a negative and don't use the word "prevent" but to use "preserving the integrity of the industrial areas through the prevention of...".	Objectives are not in order of priority but can be moved up to call attention. Difficult to prioritize a long list. Hard to predict what will come first, some easier to accomplish sooner, ability to fund certain items may impact timing.  Objective can be reordered and rephrased.
6.	Chapter 4, Land Use, Page 30 Commission comment  Land Use Map for Neighborhood Commercial Use following parcel lines- residential character	West Main St. from 6th St. to 14th St. land use follows property lines. Several parcels have changed use and a guiding principal was that through the Zoning Ordinance those parcels be developed to retain residential character but have commercial use. Should land use plan reflect this?	Following parcel lines makes sense as it is not desirable to include adjacent lots with frontage only on interior streets.  Plan can be changed or text statement added to recommend residential character in this area.
7.	Chapter 4, Land Use Commission comment  Definition/classification of Mixed Use	Mixed Use is shown under the category of Commercial, should it also be shown under Residential.	Decision was made to not have different definitions for terms used in the plan.  Mixed Use will be pulled out as its own land use category separate from residential and commercial and made clearer on the land use map.
8.	Chapter 4, Land Use Commission comment  Multi-Family Residential Development	Is the text regarding multi-family specific enough to direct a developer if a project is desirable and whether the text accurately reflects what was stated by the community in the outreach process.	Task Force heard concern about concentration of multi-family in a specific area; request to intersperse throughout the city. In project outreach, consistently heard "no apartments" which is a form of ownership, not a land use, the type of land use is multi-family residential. Text is 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. Regarding location, it refers you to the land use plan.

9.	Chapter 4, Land Use Commission comment  Mixed Use outside of Downtown	Plan identifies downtown as the primary place for mixed use development but there are two other potential sites identified (old St. Charles Mall and Charlestowne Mall). Is there an objection by the community to any mixed use with residential outside of downtown?	Comment from audience- The community isn't opposed to mixed use, but rather there needs to be a balance of uses within mixed use areas that are sensitive to the location; the appropriate mix of uses varies in each location. Request to see the statement added: "balance of uses" unique to each site.
10.	Chapter 4, Land Use Commission Comment  Old St. Charles Mall Site	Question about what the community said relative to the old St. Charles Mall site.	Comment from audience-North half behind Jewel should be commercial/office/education, not just residential. Compromise idea of residential south of Rt. 38 along Bricher Rd. Other undeveloped parcels permit mixed use (Bricher Commons behind Meijer). Concern about the future of land use direction along Randall Rd; how this site is developed is important for the success of the corridor. Higher density commercial is needed here for success.
11.	Chapter 4, Land Use Public Comment  Neighborhood Meetings	Plan should include a policy on neighborhood meetings before a Concept Plans application is filed to initiate discussion between residents and developer. If it can't be a requirement, it could be stated as a policy in the Comprehensive Plan.	In the past this was investigated and it was determined the City could not legally require this in the Zoning Ordinance. Mr. Lavigne stated he has not seen this requirement in a code before.
12.	Chapter 4, Land Use Commission comment	"Sensitivity and balance"- include those words in the plan because they speak volumes.	Need to determine how/where language would be integrated.
<b>1/29/13</b>			
	<b>Chapter/Page/ Topic</b>	<b>Comment/Question</b>	<b>Response/Follow Up/Discussion</b>
13.	Chapter 4 Land Use Commission Comment Overlay of Future Land Use Map	Request was made to show an overlay of proposed future land use map over existing future land use map.	Maps were prepared showing outline of each category of land use on top of the existing land use map. It was noted that for the most part, the land use pattern is not changing significantly.
14.	Chapter 8, Downtown Subarea Page 57 Gateway locations	Question on how gateway locations were determined.	Signs would be "welcome to downtown St. Charles" to more brand and identify downtown, different than the gateway signs that exist around the community. Locations with right of way or public property were chosen. It was noted that Prairie and Rt. 31 is tricky because there is a lot going on and that area may be best served by additional study.

15.	Chapter 8, Downtown Subarea Page 67 Improvement Plan Commission Comment Prairie St. bike route	Figure does not show Prairie Street bike route recommended by the Task Force. Prairie St. from 7 <sup>th</sup> to Rt. 31 is a steep incline and the intersection of Rt. 31 & Prairie is challenging. Comment that Prairie Street in general (a collector) will need to be modified to safely accommodate bike traffic, it was noted that this is not directly addressed in the document. When to address this?	Missing bike path segment was acknowledged in memo to PC and will be corrected.
16.	Chapter 8, Downtown Subarea Page 67 Public Question Downtown Overlay	Downtown Overlay recommendations do not address if changes to regulation would be temporary, what time frame, what happens to businesses if the regulations are put back into place, etc.	Plan only suggests that the issue be addressed, but how it will be addressed will be discussed when the change is being proposed and considered.
17.	Chapter 8, Downtown Subarea Page 70 Public Comment Closing Riverside Ave.	Although conceptual, the plan for Site Q shows potential for Riverside Ave. to be closed south of Illinois Ave, which may be an issue for fire trucks travelling south from the downtown station.	
18	Chapter 8, West Gateway Page 76 Commission comment Viability of three concepts for former St. Charles Mall site	Are all the plans viable, or is it possible to rate them on their viability on a scale of 1-10. If they are not viable, they should not be in the plan, but it's important to make certain that everything meets the test of viability.	Plans show land use bubbles. Depending on the intensity of each pocket, they all have some viability. Regardless of the plan, the property owner needs to work with the residents because the land use plans don't provide enough direction. One of the plans may not be chosen; options could be combined.
19.	Chapter 8, West Gateway Page 73 Commission comment Curb cuts	It was noted there is a significant difference with surrounding communities with curb cuts on Randall Road. Is eliminating curb cuts always a goal?	The City looks for opportunities to improve access and consolidating in areas like this, but there is not a program to facilitate that or force a property has to close a curb cut or provide cross access. Randall Rd. is a county road, and the County now has more stringent access policies. St. Charles has dealt with more piece meal development historically, but cross access is important in the plan. The McDonalds proposal was mentioned as an example.
20.	Chapter 8, West Gateway, Page 75 Commission Comment St. Charles Mall site alternatives	Concern that options for Towne Centre site do not provide enough detail; plans need to be more special or inspirational. "Regional Repositioning" may not meet the objectives identified for the subarea as it maintains the current function and character of the rest of the Randall Rd. corridor.	Plans were presented at public workshops and were drafted based on the outreach feedback. Comment was made that the options are "thought provoking"- not actual development plans.

21.	Chapter 8, West Gateway Commission comment Big Box Ordinances	An ordinance should be in place requiring big boxes be removed once empty for a period of time.	Ordinances can require a bond be put in place for future tear downs. (This concept is discussed in Commercial Area policies on Page 37)
22.	Chapter 8, West Gateway Commission comment General discussion on gateways and their relation to Downtown	Can the former St. Charles Mall site be a gateway to downtown? Site functions more as a gateway to Downtown Geneva. It was noted that the site should not compete with Downtown St. Charles, as there is a TIF in both areas that could be in competition.	Suggestion to add an item to the West Gateway subarea Goals or Objectives to “achieve balance” with Downtown or “complementary development” that won’t compete with Downtown, and promote connections between site and downtown.
23.	Chapter 8, West Gateway Public Comment Aspiration Statements in Goals, Objectives	In the goals and objectives and elsewhere are aspirational statements about creating within the mixed use catalyst sites a synergy so that they do not cannibalize each other but one draws people across to the other. This is a way to clarify the plan and make it more inspirational. The weight of these aspirational goals and objectives will be determined by how much a prospective developer considers these statements and Plan Commission’s review of a development proposal vs. the plan.	
24.	Chapter 8, East Gateway Commission Comment “Main Street Shopping” alternatives and naming sites	Regarding the Charlestowne repositioning alternatives, could the name be changed to “Main St. Shopping-East”, to not take away from the downtown district which is just Main St., and then something also called “Main St. shopping-West”, where signs would say to not forget to visit the other districts, but the themes would be the same as the signage, colors and landscaping.	
25.	Chapter 8, East Gateway, P. 84 Commission comment Charlestowne Mall Repositioning Alternatives	Is the “Entertainment and Events Center” needed?	Idea was presented by more than one group at the Charlestowne Mall visioning workshop.
26.	Chapter 8, Main Street plan, P. 91 Commission comment 12 <sup>th</sup> St. crossing	The 12 <sup>th</sup> Street crossing on Main Street shown on the plan was closed and is now located at the north leg of 12 <sup>th</sup> St.	
27.	Chapter 8, Main Street plan Commission comment Legend	Suggestion to change the wording or change the Legend to “Recommendations”, so it is clear these are recommended improvements.	
28.	Chapter 8, Main Street plan, P. 91 Commission comment Valley Shopping Center streets	Streets are shown through the Valley Shopping Center site on page 74 but are not reflected in the Main Street plan on page 91.	

29.	Chapter 8, Sub Area plans Public Comment Future changes to subareas	How can catalyst sites be added in the future? Will Task Force need to be reconvened to make more recommendations? Reference was made to Randall Road between Main & Dean.	Plan will be reviewed periodically, perhaps annually, and changes can be proposed for review by the Plan Commission and P&D Committee, without reconvening the Task Force.
30.	Chapter 8, West Gateway Commission comment  Site on Randall Rd. between Main and Dean	Regarding Randall Road between Main and Dean, plans shown future Woodward extension and land use of Corridor-Regional Commercial. Should other narrative text be added about this site? It was noted that this general area is unattractive and has a problematic development pattern and will need substantial access improvements for the area to be redeveloped. Developing the full commercial potential of Randall Rd. is important to the community and this is an area where it will not happen without some coordination. This is a significant entrance into the city and it should be addressed in the Comprehensive Plan.	Street improvements are shown on page 74. Land uses are shown on the land use map on page 30 – Corridor/Regional Commercial. Suggestion was made that incremental site improvements would not accomplish the access improvements, and assistance from the City may be necessary. This information could be explained in the text for a catalyst site. There was a discussion about whether this site met the criteria of a catalyst site, and if it did, what would be the boundaries. Suggestion to include all the way from Randall & Main (NW and NE corners) and extend up to Dean Street.