

**MINUTES  
CITY OF ST. CHARLES, IL  
PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE  
MONDAY, JUNE 10, 2013 7:00 P.M.**

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

**Members Absent:** None

**Others Present:** Mayor Raymond Rogina; Brian Townsend, City Administrator; 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; Joe Schelstreet, Acting Fire Chief; Chris Aiston, Director of Economic Development; Comprehensive Plan Task Force Chairman Mark Armstrong

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

The meeting was convened by Chairman Stellato at 7:04 P.M.

**2. ROLL CALLED**

Roll was called:

Present: Silkaitis, Payleitner, Lemke, Turner, Stellato, Martin, Krieger, Bessner, Lewis  
Absent: None

Chairman Stellato stated that he would be recusing himself from the Comprehensive Plan discussion, and at that time Vice Chair Bessner would be taking over the meeting.

**3. ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT**

- a. Recommendation to approve an Economic Development Incentive Agreement between the City of St. Charles and Lone Star-Cardinal Motorcycle Ventures III, LLC dba Windy City Triumph (131 S. Randall Rd.).

Mr. Aiston said back in May staff presented proposed economic development agreement terms, specifically a sales tax reimbursement agreement to incentivize Windy City Triumph to rent approximately 5,000 sq. ft. of the southerly portion of the Fox Valley Harley Davidson at 131 S. Randall Rd. He said a formal agreement has been put together by the City Attorney and the agreement provides up to essentially \$70,000 in municipal sales tax reimbursement, which is a 50% on municipal tax only or a period reaching 5-years. He said the obligations on the part of Windy City Triumph is not only to lease the 5,000 sq. ft. but to also remain in place for 10-years, along with improvements of \$25,000 for furniture and fixtures, \$24,000 in signage, \$15,000 in lighting improvements, and to hire and train new employee up to the value of \$5,000.

**Aldr. Turner made a motion to approve an Economic Development Incentive Agreement between the City of St. Charles and Lone Star-Cardinal Motorcycle Ventures III, LLC dba Windy City Triumph (131 S. Randall Rd.). Aldr. Martin seconded the motion. No additional discussion. Approved unanimously by voice vote. Motion carried.**

#### **4. COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT**

- a. Recommendation to approve amendments to Special Uses (Planned Unit Development and Drive-Through Facility) and PUD Preliminary Plan at 3900 E. Main Street (McDonald's).

Mr. O'Rourke said a petition has been submitted for a PUD amendment and also to amend their existing PUD Preliminary Plan. He said McDonald's would like to add a dual order station/drive-through to the east side of the property and also make some cosmetic changes to the architecture. He said the drive-through would extend toward the east, which would remove 8 off-street parking spaces. He said staff has reviewed the changes in regard to parking and façade changes and both will meet ordinance as well as the provisions of the PUD plan from the mid-1990s. He noted that this is part of the PUD called "Dunham Club and Rt. 64" which incorporated a much larger group of properties, which over the years have been taken out of the PUD, so as part of the amendment, staff will propose that a new amendment be made just for this PUD/site to get rid of some of the existing restrictions that do not align with current standards. He said a public hearing was held and staff along with Plan Commission recommends approval.

**Aldr. Martin made a motion to approve amendments to Special Uses (Planned Unit Development and Drive-Through Facility) and PUD Preliminary Plan at 3900 E. Main Street (McDonald's). Aldr. Turner seconded the motion. No additional discussion. Approved unanimously by voice vote. Motion carried.**

- b. Recommendation to approve amendments to Chapter 12.40 of the City Code (Corridor Improvement Program).

Mr. O'Rourke said staff and the Corridor Commission have been working together to propose some amendments to the current program because there are some opportunities where the program can be enhanced to make it more viable for certain property owners. He said some of the details being proposed include adding properties along Rt. 38 and allowing improvements in the right-of-way along the eligible properties, which are mostly in downtown. He said they have included non-profit organizations as eligible to receive grants and that would be defined in the ordinance as a group with a 501-3C designation, and that anything that gets approved for a non-profit would have to go through City Council and that for volunteer groups, such as the Boy Scouts, there would be no need to matching funds, just a grant for some materials. He said the current ordinance reads that there has to be something done above and beyond what the Zoning Ordinance requires to receive a grant and staff is proposing that instead the grant help pay for certain ordinance required landscaping only if they go above and beyond that minimum requirement. He said the Corridor Commission along with staff recommends approval.

Aldr. Payleitner asked what changed to add Lincoln Highway and where would that corridor be. Mr. O'Rourke said any property within the City that's adjoining Rt. 38 that has frontage would qualify, as well as Randall, Kirk and Main St., and he is not sure why Rt. 38 was not originally

included because it is a major commercial corridor which meets the program goals. He said the entire downtown area is eligible for the grant and in looking at Rt. 25 and Rt. 31, within the downtown are the areas that would need a grant, and then everything else along those routes outside of downtown is pretty much residential.

**Aldr. Bessner made a motion to approve amendments to Chapter 12.40 of the City Code (Corridor Improvement Program). Aldr. Turner seconded the motion. No additional discussion. Approved unanimously by voice vote. Motion carried.**

- c. Recommendation to direct staff to proceed with a general amendment pertaining to extension for amortization of non-conforming signs to October 16, 2014.

Mr. Vann said back in 2006, there was a revision to the Zoning Ordinance where a provision was put in place for amortization of non-conforming signs. In 2006/2007 staff went out and surveyed approximately 225 signs and found a little over 60 non-conforming signs. He said since the code update, there have been 2-extensions granted, in 2009 due to economic conditions, and the other extension was due to IDOT rebuilding Rt. 64. He said staff has been sending businesses and property owners notices of non-conforming signs, as well having meetings with potential business owners and property owners to identify those signs and that they will have to come down by October of 2013. He said at the direction of Mayor Rogina, staff is requesting an extension for another year due to the Rt. 64 construction.

**Aldr. Krieger made a motion to direct staff to proceed with a general amendment pertaining to extension for amortization of non-conforming signs to October 16, 2014. Aldr. Turner seconded the motion. No additional discussion. Approved unanimously by voice vote. Motion carried.**

Chairman Stellato recused himself at 7:15pm and turned the meeting over to Vice Chair Bessner.

- d. Recommendation to approve the 2013 Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Colby said back in May there was a presentation of the plan document by Devin Lavigne and John Houseal, of Houseal Lavigne and Assoc. which are the planning consultants that are assisting the city to draft the Comprehensive Plan. He noted that Mr. Lavigne was present along with Mark Armstrong-Chairman of the Comprehensive Task Force.

Mr. Colby then followed up on a brief issue/concern from the last meeting regarding the Downtown Subarea, Catalyst Site Q and the concern with emergency vehicles needing to use a portion of Riverside Ave. He said subsequent to the meeting, Staff had reviewed the proposal and is recommending that the concept of closing that road be removed from the plan. He noted that Committee members were distributed copies that evening of correspondence that Staff received. He said if the Committee is prepared to make a recommendation, staff would then revise the plan document to incorporate the Committee and Plan Commission comments. There would then be a Public Hearing based on the final draft produced following the Committee recommendation, and then there would then be a formal vote at City Council which would happen after the Public Hearing.

Vice Chair Bessner asked for comments/questions from Committee.

Aldr. Krieger stated that at the last meeting it was mentioned, on page 22, that the extension of the Prairie St. bridge would be unacceptable and she sees no mention of that, and since the no road closure was brought up for Riverside Ave., she wondered why the bridge was not, because it's a sensitive issue. Mr. Colby said if Committee would like to incorporate that in the recommendation, the change will be made in the document. Aldr. Martin said he wants that removed, page 22, item 3-Prairie St. to Adams Ave.

Aldr. Lewis thanked everyone for all their efforts and time put into the document. She would like to see a more positive picture for the West Gateway (p. 71), she feels it's a positive document and the picture is not a true representation of the west side. She then asked how it was determined that Randall Rd. is the West Gateway, because she feels it could be determined as the South Gateway. Mr. Armstrong said the Task Force's thought was, in identifying the area, in looking at the western part of the city, unlike the eastern part where most people come in on one route, people enter the town on multiple routes. He said if it were limited to just Rt. 64, the Rt. 64 corridor plan would have addressed that, but if the Council thinks a better name and/or picture would be a better representative, the Task Force would not have a problem with that. Aldr. Lewis said there are many other entrances into town and she thinks there could be a more appropriate picture. Mr. Armstrong said the caption states that the site is looked at as the largest opportunity site in the West Gateway.

Aldr. Lewis said she is thinking the goals in the document are due to existing comments and dialogue of the Task Force, and she asked for clarification of how the objectives were put into the document. Mr. Armstrong said the objectives came to the Task Force through a variety of sources, largely from focus groups that Houseal Lavigne brought in. Mr. Lavigne said everything in the document is a product of input received from the community, although at workshops, people were not articulating specific objectives, but are articulating what they would like to see. He said in thinking of goals, objectives and policies, the goals are lofty statements that may or may not ever be achieved, the objectives are more strategic. As the goals are established, all the input is looked at, and the strategic objectives are identified that need to be undertaken to work toward the goals. He said his firm took a shot, along with 2 other firms, at goals and objectives which were then brought to the Committee.

Aldr. Lewis asked if there were ever any conversation regarding annexing the Judicial Center or the Jail. Mr. Lavigne said it did come up but was decided to not target them for annexation. Mr. Colby stated that the city does have a boundary line agreement with Geneva and that property is on the Geneva side, and when the document was developed an effort was made to respect those boundary lines identified through the agreements.

Aldr. Lewis said she has received emails and has also spoken to many people from the west side regarding development of the old St. Charles Mall property and there are many different opinions, but there seems to be a bottom line that even if people are in favor of mixed-use or residential, it is still not apartments. She asked if there is any way that can be put into the document, or if it could be explained to her how the document will prohibit what the Committee thinks of as apartments. Mr. Colby said an issue came up in terms of reflecting some of the community's comments with regard to apartments. He said through zoning, the city does not regulate ownership structure of property; therefore there is no distinguishing between condominiums versus an apartment building. He said there was an interest on the part of the

Task Force to incorporate some language that spoke to the types of development that would be constructed, to frame it in such a way to say that the city encourages types of development that are typically owner occupied. He mentioned an example under the mixed-use section where it states that residential development in the mixed-use category on the mall site cannot be a stand-alone building; it needs to be above another type of use. He said there is also a section that speaks to the amenities to be provided with the development and those are the types that are typically found with an owner occupied development, such as covered parking, so there was an effort to incorporate that sort of additional direction that discusses mixed-use at that site. Mr. Armstrong said the Local Town Center concept shown is the only plan that calls for anything that is actually called out as multi-family/single-family attached and that is actually put down on Bircher Rd. where there is existing multi-family/single-family attached, and that was suggested at one of the Task Force meetings and it was very well received. He said in looking at the option of the Mixed-Use Town Center, it calls for local retail on the bottom and residential on top, not a straight apartment complex. He said that from year to year it's very important to recognize that there will be very different economic circumstances and the concern of the Task Force was developing a plan that was so specific that it would prevent anyone from bringing development to the city.

Aldr. Lewis said in the future that property could be sold to another company, and if someone came with a plan that had multiple apartment units in it, is the plan strong enough that we could say no. Mr. Colby said there are a lot of factors that can be considered in whether or not it's a desirable project, but what these redevelopment alternatives do is highlight specific elements that the city is trying to encourage at this site, but it is certainly something that is within the Council's discretion. He said the site will remain zoned for commercial use as it is today, and if anyone proposes anything different, there would need to be a review process. Aldr. Lewis asked if density or height had been addressed anywhere. Mr. Lavigne said no, but in reading Site J on page 75, which speaks specifically to the site, it states: "*The 30 acre site may represent the most significant redevelopment opportunity within the Randall Rd. corridor. Despite great potential, the opposition voiced by some members of the community to the Town Center proposal highlights the complexity and sensitivity to the site's future development. Throughout the outreach process, residents voiced different ideas for the site, underscoring the fact that the community remains split on the best use of the site.*" He said following that, the 3 different alternatives are shown, and it states that it is important to note that the final development option should be market viable due to the significance and complexity to the site, and any proposal should be subject to the PUD approval process.

Aldr. Martin said he has very serious concerns with the site and the addition of apartments and he feels it should remain a 100% commercial piece and it's the city's opportunity to gain some ground in the commercial competition. Vice Chair Bessner said it was asked earlier if the document is binding in any way if there is a residential component and he asked if that could work the other way as well. Mr. Lavigne said the document is not set in stone, and it is just a policy guide that is not regulatory, the Zoning Ordinance is regulatory. Aldr. Krieger said she agrees with Aldr. Lewis and Martin, no more apartments there, but maybe some senior housing, but her dream is an Apple Store or Grahams Chocolate. Aldr. Martin said in regard to Vice Chair Bessner's comment about the plan being binding, that he has been on the Council long enough and once it's in the plan, it's very difficult to change it because everyone refers to what the plan says and that why he wants to put a stop to it before it gets out of hand. Aldr. Turner

said his fear in putting something in stone, it doesn't give an option going forward, and he thinks people will use that as a crutch to disapprove proposals without giving it thought. He said the wider it is, the better, and there is always the PUD process that has to be gone through. Aldr. Lewis said she has heard from many residents in Ward 5 that they are not opposed to some sort of residential component, but what was heard across the board is no apartments, and she wants to know how that can be factored into the plan. Mr. Lavigne said that is consistent with what they heard also, but that you cannot regulate ownership, and in regard to senior housing, that is a form of residential land-use, and by going all commercial, you are shutting the door on that. He said if the city cannot decide on this property, 112 pages will be garbage because the city is hung up on this piece. He said by providing multiple alternatives and referring it to a PUD process, the current owner/future owner knows the site will be challenging and whatever approach taken will need to be well vetted through the process.

Aldr. Lewis asked why there had to be 3 options, couldn't there be just 2. Mr. Lavigne said they could have, but the 2<sup>nd</sup> option is somewhere between 1 and 3, allowing the Tri-City Center, the existing commercial on the south side of Rt. 38, and the Jewel, to all stay intact. Mr. Armstrong said one thing to remember that Sites H, I and J are not under unified ownership or control and it's unlikely to come to Council as a giant unified proposal. He said one experience looked at was the Miller-West Gateway annexation agreement, where there was a very specific plan and it was the same situation with multiple parcels and multiple owners with very specific land-uses, and eventually nearly all of them were changed individually. He said the same thing was done for the Charlestowne Mall, but that for the West Gateway site, they felt it very critical to not box ourselves in, and rather than provide a plan that would leave us with a plan of 30 years of asphalt, the 3-options were come up with, but as always it's the Committee's decision.

Aldr. Lemke said he was advised last time that Randall Rd. developed as a result of having housing over retail and that he certainly does not see any examples of that and he is concerned in suggesting housing over retail without having some places where that has worked in the city. He said he thinks it looks a lot like the plan rejected by the Council before he joined. Aldr. Silkaitis said he does not want apartments, there are too many already in town, and he feels the site should be commercial, and if the tone is not set now as to what is wanted, he sees no point in even doing this.

Aldr. Martin said he objects to any development being called "Town Center" and he doesn't want to see it listed anywhere in the plan. Aldr. Lemke and Aldr. Krieger agreed.

Aldr. Silkaitis said page 22 on bridges, #5, another bridge between Geneva and St. Charles is never going to happen, unless Geneva wants to do it, and he wants it removed from the plan.

Aldr Payleitner asked for clarification on page 68, the Downtown Subarea for Site G-lost parking capacity being mitigated and Site I-displaced parking accommodated elsewhere, and she sees a lot of parking being taken out, but none going in. Mr. Lavigne said on Site Q, a parking structure is identified; Site P is also identified as a potential parking structure; Site J a parking garage was part of a development proposal; and Site E. Aldr. Payleitner said the east side looks covered, but where is the parking for west side of the river. Mr. Lavigne said Site D, behind the commercial, could be explored for parking, but he doesn't think any site is specifically a catalyst for a parking garage, but certainly parking would need to be accommodated for any redevelopment. Aldr. Payleitner said she wonders if there is a balance rather than saying here's a

bunch of parking where buildings would be better. Mr. Armstrong said on page 67, there is a notice on parking for the Downtown Improvement Plan, and on page 68 there are catalyst sites for redevelopment, and page 67 talks about the general tone of downtown and that's where the parking had been implied. Mr. Lavigne said the recommendation is that the city should continue to provide parking strategically in all areas of downtown and carefully monitor demand to ensure both current and future needs are met. Aldr. Payleitner said she thinks the document takes out a lot of parking but doesn't add it. Mr. Lavigne said the plan is being sensitive to ownership, recognizing where there are no buildings are your easiest opportunity sites, as opposed to buying out. He said before anything were approved, parking would have to be incorporated.

Aldr. Lemke said he would not suggest disposing of 2-years' worth of work, but he thinks maybe seeing a resubmittal for the plans for Rt. 38 and Rt. 64 out by Kirk Rd. He said on the surface, it's a two-dimensional plan with a number of roads through the building and the problem Charlestowne Mall has with that and with a two-level mall creates a problem, and three-dimensionally that is not apparent, on a two-dimensional plan. He said it was never designed to be Geneva Commons and he would like to see a revised and resubmitted Charlestowne Mall plan because he doesn't know who would pay for all the construction, reconstruction and disconnect, and to saw through the mall does not make sense. He said there is a commercial plan that has been developed for leasing and there's a chance for leasing going forward and it's marketed as an enclosed mall. Mr. Lavigne said page 83 does show the mall fully intact with development opportunities around the mall. Aldr. Lemke he is not aware of any plan to put in residential and if the plan is to keep the same lower area ratio, he doesn't know where residential would come out and how the soils would be accommodated that would exist under the detention areas. He doesn't understand how it would happen without very expensive plans to relocate detention areas, its unsuitable soils, and he wants to see a revise and resubmit for the Charlestowne Mall to exclude residential.

Aldr. Payleitner asked how to go about getting these changes made. Ms. Tungare said a recommendation could be made tonight on the revisions and then the revised document can move forward to public hearing.

Aldr. Lemke made a motion to remove residential from both the mall site and Charlestowne Mall. Aldr. Martin seconded the motion.

Roll Call Vote:

Ayes:	Silkaitis, Payleitner, Lemke, Martin, Krieger
Nays:	
Abstain:	Lewis, Turner
Motion Carried.	

Aldr. Lewis asked if there would be some sort of index or table of contents. Mr. Lavigne said that could be done along with some sort of key word index and he would look into it.

Mr. Armstrong questioned the motion just made and voted on and asked for clarification as to the direction being provided to produce a document to comply with it. He asked if no residential means no dwelling units of any type on either site. Aldr. Martin said when the Comprehensive Plan comes out, the Committee wants those two areas shown as primarily commercial and no residential on either parcel, and on page 112, it states to adopt and use the plan, the plan should

become the city's official policy guide and used on a regular day to day basis, and he is afraid that if alternatives are allowed in the plan the city will not get what we want. Mr. Armstrong said so for clarification there will be no senior or adaptable housing on either site. Mr. Lavigne said it was not his idea to add residential to the areas, it was the community, and to take it out may trump citizen input. Mr. Lavigne said there is a realigned Foxfield Dr. that would come through there that would separate the residential and the commercial of the mall, but a portion of the parcel is already subject to the court decision, the land use is already dictated, but there is only a piece added as residential. Aldr. Lemke said it would fill in two detention areas and if Charlestowne Mall has already spoken with the city about the ability to use and drive-through, and that would mean some discussion that he does not think has happened, but that they do not mind people driving through there now. Mr. Lavigne said the plan was to better insulate the neighborhood, not to formalize the more convenient cut through. Mr. Armstrong asked if the Court decision says residential and the city agrees, is it the will of the Council to disregard the Court agreement and remove the residential, and again he is just looking for clarification. Aldr. Lemke said he understands that there is a court decree that provides some residential but it is not what is described in the plan and he thinks it should be consistent with the court decree and not try to paint the rest of the neighborhood.

Mr. Townsend clarified that the consent decree being referenced includes a long list of uses and not all are commercial in nature, and in using the term "commercial" be cautious about that because the consent decree does include a specified list of what's allowed on the property, but he agrees to the extent of consistency that commercial is not the appropriate use. Aldr. Lemke said he would defer to that agreement and the folks in the neighborhood recognize that it's in place. Mr. Armstrong clarified that the Committee wants to make it consistent with the decree and those areas not covered by the decree should not have any residential nor dwelling units whatsoever. Committee agreed. Mr. Lavigne said that's an easy change.

Vice Chairman Bessner asked about pocket parks not being in the plan, and asked if they would create the issue of who pays for them because they are small enough that the Park District would not want to deal with them, which means the city would have to. Mr. Lavigne said it is listed in the plan for the city to work with the Park District to reevaluate their 5 acre minimum in recognition that there are few developments that are going to generate that type of park dedication, and that if they will continue to get land through the city's land cash dedication ordinance, they will have to reevaluate their position. Vice Chairman Bessner asked if because there is that disconnect and thinking 10-15 years out, should they give up on it. Aldr. Krieger said she would not give up, she would require any development of any size require a dedicated park area with an association to cover the costs, and green space is very important. Vice Chairman Bessner asked if that could be adjusted in the plan, and asked if it's expected that in the next 15-20 years that there will be the gap of who worries about a park. Mr. Lavigne said he doesn't think there is anything in the plan that obligates the city to start owning and maintaining park sites, but to first work with the Park District.

Vice Chairman Bessner asked about page 64-Subarea Goals and using full utilization of the Fox River as a recreational environmental asset, and what does that mean. Mr. Lavigne said it's a lofty goal that is easily defined and hard to ever achieve, but clarified it doesn't directly mean activities on the river.

Vice Chairman Bessner said in regard to residential and the state of the unknown economy that he does not want to see the city handcuffed in a situation with the option of any kind of residential or grand development that might come along and fit in either of those mall properties, but he thinks the component needs to be left open. Aldr. Martin said future Council can change the plan anytime they want to if there is enough votes to do it. Vice Chairman Bessner said he understands that but it was said earlier that it's hard to do. Aldr. Martin said it is a hurdle but if it happens it will be appropriate for what the community and Council wants.

Aldr. Martin made a motion to remove from the plan any reference to item 3 and 5 on page 22.

Mr. Armstrong asked for clarification on the motion and asked if the intent is to remove Woodward extending to Randall Rd. or it is just to remove Prairie to Adams. Aldr. Martin said the 2 can be separated but right now they are listed together so as of right now both are included in his motion. Mr. Armstrong said the motion is to not complete logical gaps in the existing roadway network; the two roads cited were simply examples of what the Task Force felt were logical gaps. Aldr. Turner said Woodward should be connected to Randall Rd.

Aldr. Martin amended his motion to only remove Prairie to Adams as an example. Aldr. Krieger seconded the motion.

Roll Call Vote:

Ayes: Silkaitis, Payleitner, Lemke, Turner, Martin, Krieger, Lewis  
Nays:  
Absent:  
Motion Carried.

Vice Chairman Bessner asked for public comment.

Kim Malay-526 S. 16<sup>th</sup> St.-said the Comprehensive Plan is supposed to be the City's vision and what is being aimed toward but as Aldr. Martin noted, the document can be amended, therefore if the mall areas are put in the plan as commercial only, and say a senior housing proposal comes along, the plan can be amended. She said if it's not stipulated what is being looked for first then the city will never really get what is wanted and what in the best interest for the community. She noted that she attended many focus meetings and there was a resounding amount of residents wanting no residential and she hopes the Committee is really listening to what the residents have said.

Vanessa Bell-Lasota-1610 Howard St.-referenced the Plan Commission notes, item #46 discusses Chapter 9 on the Residential Areas Framework Plan on page 34, Site F, which is listed as a potential development site and along that road there are two completely land marked properties protected by the County covenants, Red Gate Farm and Seven Oaks Farm. She said initially it was discussed to put them on the key and it has devolved to a statement that text would be added under Historic Preservation noting the landmarked farmsteads. She agrees with an index and a cross referencing index because the protection is being buried because it is not available for development. She said she strongly recommends it be indicated on the key and in the framework plan. Mr. Armstrong said his plan says that Site F could be serviced by city water and waste water and consequentially could develop a single-family residential, however it recognizes the landmarked farms and states that development of the site should strive to preserve

its historic assets. Ms. Bell-Losata said that by using the term “sensitivity should be given” is not clear wording and is very vague and is still referring to development of those parcels. Mr. Lavigne said a small part of 2 separate parcels are historically designated and what the text states is that development that could surround them.

Brian Lavalpe-1219 Dean St.-said that by creating the road through the back of Charlestowne Mall it would stifle the future expansion of the mall along with taking away parking and possible out lot development. He said as far as apartments and not wanting them on those two sites, what's the difference between condos, row homes, and townhomes being developed there, because he doesn't think residents want any of that because St. Charles is a single-family home community and that's why it's the #1 place for families. He said he is not in favor of mixed use, and in looking downtown, there is the mixed use with all empty units above, and empty store fronts below, but people still living above it looks trashy and like a non-appealing place to live. He said there needs to be more futuristic thinking and not what the current trend is, St. Charles should be leaders not followers. He said the city could benefit by getting more out of the Fairgrounds and maybe take the road by the post office to connect to Rt. 38 would be a good idea to stop cut through traffic in the neighborhoods. Aldr. Turner said a lot of those roads were proposed to get more cross access. Mr. Lavalpe said he also did not see anything in the plan about creating a roadway north out of the Lexington development and that would be nice to create an extra outlet out to the north, not only for traffic purposes, but also if there were a major gas leak during construction of the sidewalk the residents would be land locked in.

Resident asked if there had been any changes to the Corporate Reserve site in the plan. Mr. Colby said it is shown in the residential frame work plan as a potential location for single-family attached development, recognizing that as it exists today it is entitled to be developed for office commercial type use, but the Task Force felt that some attached dwellings, townhomes, could be appropriate for the site if they were comparable to the density of the development that surrounds it. Aldr. Bessner said density levels that were buffering were discussed.

Aldr. Payleitner asked if the CMAP Housing Study that will be embarked on this summer could be implemented in the plan, because we may think we are a single-family residence community, but maybe not, and maybe the future will hold that multi-family and attached housing are trend for the future and we do not want to be on the back end of that. Ms. Tungare said the study could be a stand-alone policy document or it could be incorporated in the plan.

Vice Chairman Bessner asked if the comments taken that evening along with comments and suggestions from the Committee and residents for last changes will move forward tonight. Ms. Tungare said correct, and the Committee could make a recommendation tonight based on the conditions outlined and the consultant and staff could move forward to make those revisions to the plan. Aldr. Turner confirmed that it will then go to a public hearing; the comments from the public hearing will then be used to revise the plan again if Council chooses, and it will then go to Council for final approval. Ms. Tungare said she envisioned a recommendation with some revisions tonight, however the document would remain as is for the public hearing, collect additional comments at that time, and then the document would be modified just once, but if Committee wishes the plan could be modified twice. Mr. Lavigne said based on comments tonight, he suggest revising the figure on page 83-Charlestowne Mall to cut the illustration to

remove the residential and drop in the existing detention and leave the area under court decree gray.

Aldr. Martin said he would like to see the changes made before going to public hearing. Aldr. Krieger said to revise the entire plan will be difficult and she requests a summary of the changes so everyone is on the same page.

Aldr. Krieger recommended approval of the plan upon receiving a list of the changes made this evening. Aldr. Martin seconded the motion.

Roll Call Vote:

Ayes: Silkaitis, Payleitner, Lemke, Turner, Martin, Krieger, Lewis

Nays:

Absent:

Motion Carried.

Ms. Tungare asked for some clear direction on the three options for the old mall site. Mr. Armstrong said it seems to him that based on Committee's discussion that the first option is the only viable one. Ms. Tungare asked if the Committee is comfortable leaving an alternate option in the plan with some additional guidance, considerations and verbiage added to tighten it up to give some flexibility and not box ourselves in. Aldr. Bessner asked how specific it can be. Mr. Lavigne said this was gone through with the Task Force and presented as no residential on any of the uses, and when it was presented to the Task Force, they thought it had gone a little too far, so it ended up with the three options. He said the impact of stripping out the other two options would really solidify the city into the Regional Repositioning option and also scaring away someone with a creative approach to the site who may perceive amending the recently adopted Comprehensive Plan as a tremendous hurdle. He said developers in this economy are not looking to have a fight at City Hall, they are looking for a community that is welcoming and receptive to their ideas, and he thinks the best approach would be to pull together a memo that would document why there are three alternatives, what would be a worst case scenario, and the course of a development process, how it would get through and the likelihood of apartments, but shutting the door on all residential would be a limited approach to such a big piece of property. Mr. Armstrong it's important to mention that in one of the plans there's an area with mixed use, and in the third plan, it's majority mixed use, which is defined as residential uses over commercial uses, and the Task Force never stripped out all dwelling units, but if the Committee would like all dwelling units of any kind stripped out, that's fine, but they will be responsible in the long run for the plan. He said he appreciates the idea of multiple ideas, but he is not sure they are all needed if all dwelling units of any kind are being taken out. Mr. Lavigne said another alternative would be removing page 76 & 77 all together, and the site would then be guided by the language for Site J as well as the land-use plan, which highlights the site as Regional Commercial, but he does not recommend that approach. He said it would be governed by the land-use plan which highlights the site as potential for mixed-use, so it would then be corridor commercial, regional commercial on the west side and neighborhood commercial on the east, but a caveat of potential mixed use and the text where it talks about mixed-use outside of downtown.

Aldr. Martin said he is willing to live with no dwelling units on the site because that is the way it's been and no one has come forward with a project that is suitable and acceptable for that site. Aldr. Lemke said it the largest and most successful area of Randall Rd. and is the city's window to Randall Rd. and until we try that out, he's willing to stand with no residential.

Ms. Tungare said from comments made earlier on the procedural standpoint and modifying and amending the plan in the future for a proposal that warrants consideration, it cuts both ways, and her experience tells her that if that if the city were in that position in the future and the city decided to amend the plan, the city would be criticized for doing it backwards by entertaining a proposal and then modifying the plan in a reactive mode in response to a proposal. She said doing it the way that it's been presented is in line with planning principles and practice where a vision is established and to have some flexibility rather than a position to be in a reactive mode.

Mr. Lavigne said maybe the solution is to strengthen the preference for commercial, then the city could be receptive to creative approaches, because what was heard consistently through outreach was no apartments, not no residential, so he suggested strengthening the position of the preferred approaches as a commercial corridor, but to make that viable for a developer, it may need a residential component. He said it's a big property and it can't all front Randall Rd., that is why it's failing now, and the area behind Jewel fronts Lincoln Hgwy., therefore it does not have the traffic count and cannot compete with the sites along Randall Rd. Aldr. Martin said he disagrees as far as the viability of the commercial on the property and under the current ownership nothing is going to happen to it, but under different ownership there may be a different opinion on that. Aldr. Lewis said she supports, as stated in the past, medical and educational business on the property and she asked which scenario would include those. Mr. Lavigne said either the second or third mixed-use, not the first one because it's only regional outlots and big box parcels. Aldr. Lewis said she is always for creating good jobs in St. Charles. Mr. Lavigne said medical offices are only allowed in the red areas but the language could be amended to include education, but it would not be what he would call commercial, he thinks of it as more office/service but the quotes could be changed for any one of the two to accommodate that.

Aldr. Lewis asked what the process is to amend the plan and if it's expensive and time consuming. Mr. Lavigne said it depends on the extent of the update, but the process would be to amend the plan with a public hearing and adopt the amended plan, it would not be the 18 month process that is happening now.

Ms. Bell-LaSota asked what weight will resident comments made in the minutes have in the plan and if there is one particular area that only one resident comments on, will it be considered, is there assurance it will be considered, and when will she know it's being considered, and what is that process. Vice Chairman Bessner said it's his understanding that when the public hearing is held there will be revisions along with a summary and then there will be an open house where there will be more resident input. Ms. Bell-LaSota asked if the current comments would be at the open house. Ms. Tungare said there will not be any additional open houses, only a public hearing where the Mayor and City Council will preside and all documents will be made available on the website. Mr. Lavigne said every meeting is available on the website. Ms. Bell-LaSota said her concern is some very important points may be lost because they are in documents that may never gravitate over so she suggests along the way some sort of assurance that it will evolve with everything said here tonight. Aldr. Payleitner said that assurance should lie with the hard

working Task Force and trust that it's taken into consideration and there's no need to rehash that, they have done their job and we do not need to re-do what they have done. Vice Chairman Bessner said he agrees, he was part of the Task Force and all information on all parcels was funneled to come up with a very broad plan of what to go towards in the next 15-20 years, but as a Committee tonight, it's been decided to put together a list of changes and request a summary.

Ms. Malay said she understands Ms. Tungare's thought about scaring developers away and lately we have had the appearance of being hard to deal with. She said developers are being led on through the long process all because of what our Comprehensive Plan says, and she feels we are better off taking things out and narrowing it down and having developers come ask, and if it's viable then it could be brought forward. She said in regard to land and education, medical and having major regional commercial, let it be uses besides residential to be open to other things. She feels that it having to be on Randall Rd. to be successful is wrong because St. Charles Mall was very successful where it was and now there is the Commons which we did not have once that property became vacant. She said she feels the old mall site along with the old Dominick's site is critical to success of the redevelopment of Randall Rd.

Vice Chairman Bessner asked Committee for any last changes. None.

**5. ADDITIONAL BUSINESS**-None.

**6. ADJOURNMENT**

Aldr. Martin made a motion to adjourn. Seconded by Aldr. Turner at 9:00pm.