

**MINUTES
CITY OF ST. CHARLES, IL
PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE
MONDAY, OCTOBER 28, 2013 7:00 P.M.**

Members Present: Silkaitis, Payleitner, Turner, Stellato, Bancroft, Martin, Krieger, Bessner, Lewis

Members Absent: Lemke

Others Present: Mayor Raymond Rogina; Mark Koenen, City Administrator; Peter Suhr, Acting Director of Public Works; Rita Tungare, Director of Community Development; Russell Colby, Planning Division Manager; Matthew O'Rourke, Planner; Chris Tiedt, Development Engineering Division Manager; Bob Vann, Building & Code Enforcement Manager; Chief Lamkin, Police Dept.

1. CALL TO ORDER

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

2. ROLL CALLED

Roll was called:

Present: Silkaitis, Payleitner, Turner, Stellato, Bancroft, Martin, Krieger, Bessner, Lewis

Absent: Lemke

Chairman Stellato noted that staff was looking for a motion that evening as long Committee was able to agree in regard to the Special Use for the PUD for Charlestowne Mall Redevelopment and that any comments from the audience would be allowed after staff and the developer spoke.

3. COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

- a. Recommend approval of an Amendment to Special use for PUD for the Charlestowne Mall Redevelopment.

Mr. Colby said the Charlestowne Mall PUD was approved in 1988, the Mall opened in 1991, and the last time the building was expanded was in 1995 with the theatre being added. He said the application currently before the Committee is to amend the 1988 PUD Ordinance and establish new PUD standards to facilitate the redevelopment of the property. He said the original PUD was based upon there being a single building located at the center of the lot, which is the current mall building, and the Ordinance does not allow for additional structures on the property. He said at a minimum that would need to be amended to allow additional buildings, but that staff is also using this opportunity to have the Ordinance amended to better reflect the city's current standards for building design and landscaping.

Mr. Colby said in terms of process, 2 document would be approved in connection with the application; 1) PUD Standards Document-which has the list of zoning parameters that would apply to the PUD 2) Concept Site Plan-which will demonstrate the design intent for the PUD and will be attached to the PUD Ordinance. He noted that the other plan documents provided by the developer are only to demonstrate the feasibility of the concept being proposed and will not be

approved at this time. He said the intent of the application is to put in place standards for the developer to begin drafting more detailed plans for the site, and any future PUD Preliminary Plans will need to be submitted to the city for review by the Plan Commission and approved by City Council. He said the PUD Preliminary Plans will include: building architecture, landscape plans and more detailed site engineering. He noted that future applications could be submitted for the building itself or the individual outlot buildings as they are developed, but that the Preliminary Plans, although required to go to a public meeting before Plan Commission, do not require any future public hearing unless there were an amendment to the PUD Ordinance being requested. He said the Plan Commission conducted a public hearing on the proposed application and recommended approval in a 4-1 vote, with 2 members absent, and staff has also provided a recommendation for approval.

David Pyle, Krausz Companies-44 Montgomery, San Francisco, CA-Noted changes that had been made since the last meeting with Committee. He showed an updated concept plan done by a civil engineer which showed the buildings placed according to their current locations, the layout of parking, circulation, and pad areas, which depict where a future building could be placed depending on tenant leasing. He said the sizes are not totally determined, but determined by parking and the types of uses will be financial institutions, fast casual food or sit down dining food. He said as a result of the Plan Commission meeting, some further studies for site circulation have been done and they have put in some additional sidewalks to try to create a link with the residential behind the project. He said they are unsure about the current sidewalks coming into the site along Rt. 64 because they are state owned, but if possible they would have connections to that, and they are also trying to connect the pad buildings with the main mall as best they can. He said the setback along Rt. 64 would be a 20 ft. setback where there is parking and a 15 ft. setback if there are drive lanes for a drive-through, so there is plenty of setback for any future sidewalks or work along Rt. 64.

Mr. Pyle said the original sketch did not detail parking between the buildings or how the ring road would change, but in the new sketch there is quite a bit of parking between the pad buildings. He said there was discussion at the Plan Commission meeting regarding trying to work with not having all the parking on the other side of the ring road to support the buildings and it was considered best to keep the parking between the buildings themselves. He said the new illustration shows more parking closer to the buildings with further definition in regard to the parking stalls in the draft PUD (4-cars per 1,000 outside of the ring road) and the idea is to get the stalls as self-sufficient as possible without relying on people to have to cross the street so often.

Mr. Pyle said there was some housekeeping on wall signs in the first draft seen for retail A and B, and both of the buildings could have more than 1 tenant, so it was limiting to only allow 1 sign, so it's been revised to read "1 sign per business, per side".

Mr. Pyle said the description was vague for the maximum height of the project and now has been rewritten that it would not be developed any higher than the highest point of the existing mall, which is the skylight over the center court. He said there is an opportunity to let the vertical cinema sign go up a little higher, but they are trying to stay within the envelope shape of the existing center.

Mr. Pyle noted that there were conceptual landscaping plans included in the packet, but that all drawings are conceptual at this point.

Aldr. Bessner asked about the building size and a roof line maximum elevation of 829 ft. Mr. Pyle said that is sea-level and is around 54-58 ft. and the upper level of the mall is at 776 ft.

Curt Henningson-220 Millington Way- He thanked the Committee for allowing him to offer his thoughts and that he was not there to object to the improvement of Charlestowne Mall. He said as an informed and knowledgeable citizen and a member of the Planning Commission he was there to point out that the execution of the proposed conceptual site plan may be problematic based upon the information that has been supplied to date. He thanked the Committee for their consideration and stated that the City Administrator's office knows how to reach him if there were any questions for him.

John Rabchuk-914 Ash St.-said he does not object to the mall and he thinks everyone is excited to have the mall back to life, but he wants to encourage the Committee and the Council as a whole to take things very carefully and in consideration for what is going to happen here. He said he know the developer has made some considerations for pedestrian walkways but he sees an area that seems exactly like the Fresh Market entrance off of Bricher Rd., which is not safe. He suggested bringing the ring road in above the buildings to create more parking by the outbuildings, to be more self-supporting, and then there would be very few instances where people would have to cross at a pedestrian level. He said the problem is that there are restrictions as to how many parking spaces have to be in proximity to VonMaur etc. He said he thinks 50-years in the future, people will remember this Council and ask "who let these cross sections in here and created an intersection just like Fresh Market?" and that they should deal with it now, long before it becomes an issue and people have to deal with it all the time because it's a safety hazard. He said the intent is to sell all the outlots and subdivide, which he does not object to, but he hopes the Council will take careful consideration, because what would happen if the outlots are successful and the mall is not. He said it would kill another opportunity to develop the mall, so is there a way to tie the subdivision in to make sure the mall is developed properly first. He said at the public hearing it was said we are throwing rose petals in front of the developers, but this is a business transaction and nobody is out to get the better of anybody else, but it has to be thought through what it will look like in 50 years from now. He asked if there would be public funds allocated toward the development, and if so, what source.

Chairman Stellato said he would like to respond to the 3 negatives from Mr. Rabchuk. He said it was way too early in the process to know if there would be public funding, but if there is, the Council has made it clear they are not interested in a TIF. Mr. Rabchuk said he didn't think a TIF would apply. Chairman Stellato said it could, based on the blighting requirements today, but to look at TIF is probably not the right answer, but sharing in some type of sales tax based on what we are getting today from the mall, he personally would be open to that. Chairman Stellato said he doesn't feel the intersection is even close to the one at Fresh Market, most of the traffic will go straight in toward Von Maur, with ancillary traffic to the right, but if it is an issue it can be dealt with by traffic control. He said that intersection was not supposed to be developed that close to the intersection and the 2 driveways between Lowes and Fresh Market ended up being lined up and the intersection ended up that way. Mr. Rabchuk pointed out another intersection in the proposed plan and stated that if there were multiple tenants in a building there, there is zero parking. Chairman Stellato mentioned Crate and Barrel at Geneva Commons. Mr. Rabchuk said that is no better than Fresh Market. Chairman Stellato said there is not any problem with parking in the lot and walking across a guided cross walk to get to any of the stores or restaurants. Mr. Rabchuk said he thinks that there may be issues there but he would defer to the Police Chief and his knowledge. Chairman Stellato said so far there have not been any negative comments

regarding the intersections and he has not yet seen a shopping center developed where you would not have to cross some type of road. He said if you were to put the parking right up against the building it would be difficult to design, draw and build.

Chairman Stellato said in regard to the outlot ownership that he is not sure why that would be a problem. Mr. Rabchuk said this site is one of the most valuable pieces and if it's developed and successful any development of this could be a secondary and abandoned. Chairman Stellato said there are other malls that have separate ownership of the outlots and asked if Mr. Rabchuk was saying to not tie anything together as far as public funds. Mr. Rabchuk said if public funds are used for utility development or extension, and therefore we are increasing the value of those even further, but he is not saying that is wrong and he actually suggested that while he was campaigning, he just thinks it should be taken into consideration what the possibilities would be for that and what it could mean downstream if something happens and it's not developed. Chairman Stellato said there have been other developers spoken to about this site and there has not been one that has not suggested it needs more outlots, so there is no question there will not be outlots. He asked if the question is more toward ownership and incentive for those outlots. Mr. Rabchuk said it's also a matter of timeline because the focal point for the city is making that mall go and it should be a priority, and maybe tie the outlots to the significant completion of what they want to do to the mall. Chairman Stellato thanked Mr. Rabchuk for his comments.

Chairman Stellato asked staff how to proceed. Mr. Colby said in the staff report there is recommendation provided for approval and with a recommendation the PUD Ordinance will be presented to the City Council on November 4, 2013. He said the approval would be for the PUD development standards and the concept site plan presented this evening.

Aldr. Bessner made a motion to approve an amendment to Special Use for PUD for the Charlestowne Mall redevelopment. Motion was seconded by Aldr. Krieger.

Roll Call:

Ayes: Turner, Bancroft, Martin, Krieger, Bessner, Lewis, Silkaitis, Payleitner

Nays:

Abstain:

Absent: Lemke

Motion Carried. 8-0.

4. ADDITIONAL BUSINESS –None.

5. EXECUTIVE SESSION-None.

- Personnel
- Pending Litigation
- Probable or Imminent Litigation
- Property Acquisition
- Collective Bargaining

6. ADJOURNMENT-7:25PM

Aldr. Silkaitis made a motion to adjourn at 7:25PM. Seconded by Aldr. Bessner. No additional discussion. Approved unanimously by voice vote. Motion carried.