

**MINUTES
CITY OF ST. CHARLES, IL
PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE
MONDAY, JULY 8, 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, Fire Chief; Chris Aiston, Director of Economic Development; Chris Minick, Director of Finance; Comprehensive Plan Task Force Chairman Mark Armstrong; Task Force Members: Brian Doyle, Betsy Penny, John Rabchuk

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, Lemke, Turner, Stellato, Bancroft, Martin, Krieger, Bessner, Lewis

Absent: None

Aldr. Payleitner made an announcement to acknowledge Aldr. Bessner's birthday.

3. MAYOR'S OFFICE

- a. Recommendation to approve a Class B2 Liquor License for Puebla Modern Mexican, LLC, 51 S. 1st Street, St. Charles (former Wild Monk).

Mayor Rogina said Mr. Tony Alfonso, who also owns Pizzeria Neo located at 31 S. 1st Street, has submitted all paperwork including liquor license, background check, site plan and a menu. He said this is a cornerstone business to the plaza and to the 1st St. development and he highly recommends approval for the license. He noted that Mr. Alfonso was there to answer any questions.

Aldr. Lewis asked for the hours. Mayor Rogina said Monday-closed, Tues-Thurs.-Noon till 10pm, and Friday, Saturday and Sunday-Noon till 11pm, and in looking at the B2 license, it is predominantly food with a holding bar.

Aldr. Turner made a motion to approve a Class B2 Liquor License for Puebla Modern Mexican, LLC, 51 S. 1st Street, St. Charles (former Wild Monk). Motion was seconded.

Roll Call Vote:

Ayes: Silkaitis, Payleitner, Lemke, Turner, Bancroft, Bessner, Lewis
Nays: Martin, Krieger
Abstain:
Motion Carried. 7-2.

4. ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

- a. Recommendation to approve a Resolution authorizing the Mayor and City Clerk to execute amendment to an Economic Development Incentive Agreement between City of St. Charles and St. Charles Chrysler Dodge Jeep, Inc. (1611 East Main St.).

Mr. Aiston said in August 2012 the Council approved a Sales Tax Reimbursement Agreement between the City and St. Charles Chrysler Dodge Jeep. He said the agreement was for the property owner to make certain improvements to the existing dealership, and to also purchase property across the street at Tyler lots 1 and 2, which has been accomplished. He said the agreement committed through an exhibit was that the dealership expansion allow for fleet sales to be placed on lot 1, but since the agreement, the owner has determined that he would rather it be on lot 2, because it's a less viable commercial property in terms of exposure, and he wants to retain lot 1 for a better use such as commercial or office. He said staff feels the change is preferable with respect to the impact on the local economy and it still accomplishes the objective of the reimbursement. He said plans have been submitted and are under review and if Council approves the exhibit amendment the dealership would be responsible to construct the lot according to approval of plans.

Chairman Stellato clarified that nothing would change for lot A and B and it's just simply switching lot 1 and 2. Mr. Aiston said correct, the ownership stays the same, it's just the use for lot 1 and 2 that is switching.

Aldr. Payleitner made a motion to approve a Resolution authorizing the Mayor and City Clerk to execute amendment to an Economic Development Incentive Agreement between City of St. Charles and St. Charles Chrysler Dodge Jeep, Inc. (1611 East Main St.). Motion was seconded. No additional discussion. Approved unanimously by voice vote. Motion carried.

- b. Recommendation to create a "Knowledge Based Employment Incentive Pilot Program" and utilizing such pilot program to secure The Clarke Group's Headquarters and Research and Development facilities.

Mr. Aiston said staff has designed a new program designed with The Clarke Environmental Group to incentivize the company to locate in St. Charles for an expansion and consolidation of their use. He said they are currently located in Schaumburg and Roselle and Dr. Lyle Clarke, who is the Chairman and CEO of the Company, was there to show a presentation.

Dr. Lyle Clark stated he was a resident of St. Charles for 28 years but currently resides in Princeton, IL. He said he has controlled mosquitos for St. Charles for a number of years and today Clarke is a global environmental product and service company who specializes in mosquito control and the management of aquatic habitat. He said their mission is to help communities around the world become more livable, safe and comfortable, and their products and services reach about 300 million people in 40 countries, but their vision is to reach 660 million people with their products and services.

Dr. Clarke gave a brief history of the private and family operated company whose future is driven by 3 passions: innovation, community and sustainability. He said they have created a new innovative product created for mosquito control from 1-150 days which is all organic, is OMRI certified, and won the Presidential Green Chemistry Challenge Award in 2010. He said their 2014 goal is to have 20% of their energy coming from renewable resources, reduce their carbon footprint by 25%, reduce their waste stream by 50% and give back to the communities they live and work in. He said in regard to aquatic services they have developed a precision application technology where it pinpoints where the weeds are and reduces the amount of herbicide by over 50%. He said he believes there is quite a bit of expansion internationally and they currently have distribution companies and offices in Mexico, Australia, Brazil and their next venture is for the public health market. He said the company's management team has won many awards but they are very proud that last year they received a \$3 million grant from the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation to create a new control strategy for Malaria in Africa and all other places it's found, and also in 2012 they won the Illinois Governor Sustainability Award.

Dr. Clarke said the property they are looking at is 675 Sidwell Ct. and they are using a local architect and they want the building to reflect their culture, which will have a corporate office, extensive R&D, a knowledge center and an extremely green facility shooting for LEED certification. He said the outside will also reflect the culture with onsite renewable energy production and the use of ecological restoration for rain gardens and native plant species with a lot of outdoor gathering and meeting spaces and will be very attractive to the community.

Dr. Clarke explained the many benefits for the city for attracting a knowledge-based employer, including: creating 10-15 new jobs favoring residents by putting them on the city's website; a building project will be financed locally by using local contractors; and recruiting at East and North High Schools for summer jobs/science internships. He said it's a knowledge-based company with an average wage of \$80,000, with a healthy benefits program. He said the business will also bring in tourism due to vendors, suppliers, customers and visitors from all over the world and it will become an educational resource for students and a catalyst to attract other knowledge based companies to the city.

Mr. Aiston showed a PowerPoint presentation explaining the proposed knowledge-based employment incentive program. He said the purpose is to incentivize The Clarke Group to select St. Charles over Ames, Iowa, and the funding authority under Illinois law is that the city may appropriate and expend funds for economic development purposes including incentive grants directly to private business enterprises. He said the reason for creating the program would be to create opportunities for new employment, develop the local economy and provide incentives for business enterprises to locate in the city. He said according to an economic impact study done by NIU, the value of Clarke business activities to the area economy for existing operations is

\$28.1 million and the planned expansion would be \$7.7 million in economic activity. He said Clarke's capital cost to acquire and occupy the facility would be \$4 million, which would include a building renovation of \$600,000, and would be an economic impact of \$4 million over a 2-year project. He said the targeted business and employment types would be environmental research and development laboratories or services for management, professional, administrative and technical positions. He said for employment at occupancy, the direct would be 71 jobs at \$6.14 million, and indirect would be 84 jobs at \$4.1 million, and after 2-years, would be direct at 15 additional jobs at \$0.9 million and indirect at 16 additional jobs at \$0.8 million.

Mr. Aiston said Staff recommends providing employment incentive grant funds directly to Clarke for each employee (both existing, relocated employees, and new hires at proposed St. Charles facility) with a minimum annual salary of \$50,000, with additional grant funds available for new intern hires. He said additional bonus payouts are included for each such employee and intern that resides in or near the City of St. Charles. He said the maximum amount the City will pay the company in a given year is as follows: Year 1: \$80,000; Year 2: \$65,000; Year 3: \$50,000; Year 4: \$50,000; and Year 5: \$50,000. Further, the maximum amount the City will pay to Clarke over five years shall be \$275,000.

Chairman Stellato asked for clarification regarding any payment made being made at the end of the year. Mr. Aiston said yes, they will have to prove up their employment based on the addresses of the employees.

Aldr. Martin made a motion to create a "Knowledge Based Employment Incentive Pilot Program" and utilizing such pilot program to secure The Clarke Group's Headquarters and Research and Development facilities. Motion was seconded by Aldr. Turner. No additional discussion. Approved unanimously by voice vote. Motion carried.

5. COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

- a. Discussion regarding the establishment of a Special Service Area (SSA) to fund proposed improvements in the Oaks of St. Charles Subdivision.

Mr. Tiedt said representatives from the Oaks HOA have approached the city to establish an SSA to fund rehabilitation and improvement of privately owned streets and infrastructure. He said some of the improvement being contemplated includes installation of storm sewer and stormwater detention to alleviate existing drainage problems. He said one of the basins is in the northeast corner and two are on the interior parcel, with storm sewer scattered throughout the site. He said another item is the installation of retaining walls and landscaping to help alleviate existing erosion control issues, which are located on the east side of the property where hills are steep, as well as the north side. He said they also plan to resurface the privately owned streets throughout the subdivision, which will entail reconstruction of some portions and also narrowing to add green space and reduce impervious surface. They also intend to bring some of the primary sidewalks up to ADA compliance. He said legal counsel has advised staff that the establishment of an SSA to fund these private improvements is feasible with the granting of certain easements and city costs associated would also be covered through the SSA.

Chairman Stellato commented that the letter prepared by the association was very well done, and he asked if every time an SSA is established, if the understanding is that there has to be more

than 50% of the homeowners to agree. Mr. Tiedt said correct, and the association has submitted a signed petition from the residents within the community which identifies that there is more than 51%. Chairman Stellato asked if they understand the costs borne by them paid through their tax bills going for however long it take to pay it off. Mr. Tiedt said yes, that is his understanding, but the HOA is here if they had anything to add.

Aldr. Bessner asked what the length of the SSA is and if it could be reverted at some point. Mr. Tiedt said at a conceptual level, initially the thought would be to have the SSA cover the expenditures of the improvements, which were estimated at between \$1.2-1.4 million. He said there have been some preliminary discussions with some of the members of the HOA to keep the SSA going in perpetuity to provide funds to maintain the improvements as well.

Aldr. Bessner asked how the city would be protected from an SSA reverting back 10-15 years from now. Mr. Minick said once it's established, and if it were to go into perpetuity, he doesn't believe there is a right for an SSA to revert back to the city, so the adopting Ordinance would have to be structured that way.

Aldr. Martin said he has had the opportunity to observe the procedures that the HOA has gone through to achieve this goal and he thinks it's a win/win situation for the city and he very highly recommends it.

Aldr. Turner asked if once the roads are rebuilt, they will become city property. Mr. Tiedt said no, the intention is to keep the roads private and maintained by the association, and legal counsel has advised that an easement be retained or the HOA grant easements over those improvements that would give the public the right of access to them.

Aldr. Lewis said she commends the job done by the HOA and staff and it's a win/win situation and she feels they have really done their homework and have presented a good project.

Aldr. Lemke asked if it becomes a covenant running with the land so that future purchasers are automatically covered. Mr. Minick said a perpetual SSA would actually be recorded against the individual parcel numbers within the development, which is the mechanism by which that right to tax would stay with the property.

Charles Radovich-Geneva, IL-Attorney for the HOA-said he has had many discussions with the city attorneys regarding the process and he had a couple points of clarification. There is a statutory process to establish an SSA and the first step would be to propose the establishment and set a public hearing date, after that there is a 60-day period in which objectors may file a petition. He said that is where the 51% comes into play, if there is 51% of the property owners and 51% of the electors in the conjunctive objecting to the formation then it cannot be established. He said the association has taken the reverse tact at the suggestion of staff to show there is support and the petition has been signed by the unit owners. The concept is to have a funding mechanism to do the initial improvements and then to perpetuate the repair and maintenance on an ongoing basis through the SSA.

Chairman Stellato asked if there was a vote to be taken, or if staff was looking for any objections. Mr. Radovich said the association would love to have a direction to authorize staff

and city attorney to participate with himself to create the necessary ordinances to get to the next step. Chairman Stellato said that sounds like a motion.

Aldr. Silkaitis said since its being done backwards, is the petition a legal document. Mr. Radovich said the association has conducted several informational meetings with their members and provided information sheets to them, and what's been done in the past is assessments through the HOA, which are difficult because there is not this much of an assessment to do this type of large capital improvement.

Aldr. Bancroft said 57 of the 75 units were represented, and 52 out of 57 signed the petition, and from the association's organizational documents, will they be in the position to grant easements and property rights. Mr. Rabchuk said yes, they had a required meeting of the unit owners authorizing the board to establish the easement documents with the city and under the base declaration they have somewhat authority as well, already.

Aldr. Martin made a motion to direct staff to proceed with the SSA. Motion was seconded by Aldr. Lemke.

Roll Call Vote:

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

Nays:

Abstain:

Motion Carried. 9-0.

- b. Recommendation to approve a General Amendment to Title 17 of the City Code (Zoning Ordinance) regarding residential driveways.

Mr. Colby said the General Amendment application initiated by staff was to modify the Zoning Ordinance requirements for residential driveways. He said the rules were enacted in 2006 and prior to that the city did not regulate the size of residential driveways on private property, and staff is proposing to loosen the restrictions somewhat. He said over the past few years staff, has encountered situations where homeowners are unable to replace their driveway at a similar size as to what existed when their house was originally constructed. He said it has occurred in some neighborhoods where the driveway they were proposing to replace were very common and similar to the ones constructed when the neighborhood was built. He said staff went through a process of researching existing conditions of driveways in town and is proposing 3 changes; 1) Clarify that two access points are allowed for circular driveways, each up to 18 ft. The extent of the driveway on the lot itself will continue to be regulated based on the percentage of front yard pavement coverage. This will enable existing circular driveways in larger lot residential zoning districts to be reconstructed similar to what is common today in areas such as Woods of Fox Glen, Persimmon Woods, and Royal Fox. 2) Provide that all residential properties are at least entitled to a driveway width of 18 ft. (instead of 16 ft.). This is a more reasonable width to accommodate two cars parked next to each other. 3) Increase the allowable front yard pavement coverage for three-car front loaded garages to 33% to reflect existing conditions in neighborhoods where three-car front loaded garages are common. He said Staff along with Plan Commission, recommend approval. The Plan Commission did discuss limiting where 3-car garage driveways would be allowed, but it was not included in their recommendation.

Aldr. Lemke said it's not clear to him that existing driveways are being grandfathered in, and he wants it to be clearer and state that existing driveways are grandfathered and even if they need to be ground and resurfaced, that there is no need to narrow the driveways according to going forward regulations. Mr. Colby said that is not specifically the proposal, but it could be added. Chairman Stellato asked for clarification. Aldr. Lemke suggested having a date going forward where future reconstructions would be brought under conformance.

Aldr. Krieger asked how corner houses with driveways on the side would be affected. Mr. Colby said the percentages of lot coverage that currently exist, for the front yard, is allowed to cover 25%, the side yard is still 25%, so if it's a corner site and it's longer on the side, there is more percentage and pavement to work with.

Chairman Stellato clarified the comment by Aldr. Lemke, that if someone is working on a driveway now, or before the end of 2013, would they comply with the new ordinance if it's more to their benefit, or they would be grandfathered in as of a certain date in 2014. Mr. Colby said staff would bring it to Council and clarify the date in the Ordinance.

Aldr. Lemke made a motion to approve a General Amendment to Title 17 of the City Code (Zoning Ordinance) regarding residential driveways. Motion was seconded by Aldr. Martin. No additional discussion. Approved unanimously by voice vote. Motion carried.

- c. Recommendation to approve a General Amendment to Title 17 of the City Code (Zoning Ordinance) regarding amortization of nonconforming signs.

Mr. O'Rourke said back at the June P&D meeting staff presented this item as a heads up that amortization of nonconforming signs would end Oct. 16, 2013, and given that IDOT construction will be ongoing through the season, it was stated by Committee to extend the amortization period for 1-year.

Aldr. Krieger said given the fact that they will still be doing landscaping and clean-up next year, will the extension be enough time. Mr. O'Rourke said he does not know when IDOT has landscaping scheduled, but this extension will give basically the whole construction season of next year, minus maybe November, so he thinks IDOT would be wrapping up sometime around there, but he couldn't verify that. Aldr. Krieger said she was in an IDOT construction area that afternoon that was scheduled to be finished December 15th and it is still torn up, so she is not very optimistic and she wants to be sure if there is a problem the city would not be fined or penalized. Ms. Tungare said it could always be revisited.

Aldr. Silkaitis made a motion to approve a General Amendment to Title 17 of the City Code (Zoning Ordinance) regarding amortization of nonconforming signs. Motion was seconded. No additional discussion. Approved unanimously by voice vote. Motion carried.

Chairman Stellato recused himself at 7:45pm and turned the meeting over to Vice Chair Bessner.

- d. Recommendation to approve the 2013 Comprehensive Plan

Vice Chairman Bessner explained that Committee would be going over the 12 discussion points from the previous Planning & Development meeting on June 10, 2013. He said he would like to entertain a motion after each talking point so there is formal direction for staff to move forward. He said after that process, his goal would be for the Comprehensive Plan move on to City Council with a formal recommendation. He said once the plan is sent to Council, there would be a public hearing where public comment could be heard.

Ms. Penny asked if there would be general comment allowed. Vice Chairman Bessner said tonight they are looking for further discussion from the Committee, but that Task Force members present were more than welcome to comment.

Numbered items below reference the Planning and Development Committee Discussion Points and Recommendations Table included in the meeting packet.

1. On 6/10/13, P&D Committee approved a motion: p. 22- remove "Prairie Street east to Adams Avenue" as an example of a logical gap to complete. p. 52- remove "Extend Prairie Street/Adams Avenue to connect the river crossing to IL 25".

Aldr. Martin made a motion to approve the revision as presented in the table. Seconded by Aldr. Krieger.

Roll Call Vote:

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

Nays:

Abstain:

Motion Carried. 8-0.

2. The roadway along the railroad right-of-way (Tyler to 13th Ave.) was proposed primarily to improve access to commercial and industrial properties east of 13 Ave. The connection to Illinois Ave. is not necessary to meet this purpose; however, the connection can remain in as an option requiring further study.

Aldr. Lemke made a motion to approve the revision as presented in the table. Motion seconded by Aldr. Bancroft.

Roll Call Vote:

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

Nays:

Abstain:

Motion Carried. 8-0.

3. Add a repositioning alternative to p. 84 for the Charlestowne Mall that keeps the outer shell of the mall intact but repositions the outward façade.

Aldr. Krieger asked if in using this statement, would the city be limiting itself to the possibility of redevelopment. Mr. Colby said what is being proposed to be modified is the repositioning alternatives, which is the 3 already shown, but add a 4th option to show the entire footprint of the mall intact, with some discussion about ways to modify the exterior of the building. He said it

would change the outward appearance and show how the property is developed around the mall, but leave the mall structure intact.

Aldr. Lemke said the theatre and Kohl's are already expanded and they are architecturally similar in construction. He thinks if Neil Johnson were here, he may say some of the things that might look well and improve attractiveness and the business prospects would maybe be outlots or changes to the current façade that would equate to outlots.

Aldr. Turner clarified that all that is being added is a 4th option, so any potential buyer could take the roof off if they so desired. Mr. Colby said yes, if they wanted to present a proposal, there are options that are there to provide some direction.

Ms. Penny said she thinks that the 3 options should be left and add 1.

Mr. Rabchuk said this conversation was had many times during the Task Force meetings and what needs to be kept in mind is that the plan is just to show some ideas to say "we are open to more ideas"; it is not to be too specific, it just is to say this site is welcome to development. He said it's to say to developers "bring us a proposal", because Council has final say over it anyway. He said the Task Force thought the 3 options were enough, but certainly if the Committee needs more to feel comfortable that is fine, but the idea is to not put too many restrictions, or bound them in and tie them down. Aldr. Payleitner said or they could leave the mall as is to make it work.

Aldr. Payleitner made a motion to add a repositioning alternative that keeps the outer shell of the mall intact but repositions the outward façade, adding a 4th option on p. 84. Motion seconded by Aldr. Krieger.

Roll Call Vote:

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

Nays: Lemke, Martin

Abstain:

Motion Carried. 6-2.

4. A note can be added on all three Catalyst Sites pages (p. 68, 75, 82) stating that the sites identify alternatives if a property is proposed for redevelopment, not an interest by the City to acquire or redevelop the site.

Aldr. Silkaitis made a motion to approve the revision as presented in the table. Seconded by Aldr. Lemke.

Roll Call Vote:

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

Nays: Turner

Abstain:

Motion Carried. 7-1.

5. The text for Downtown Site Q (p. 68) notes that the closing of Riverside Ave. would need to be further analyzed to determine the impact. Based on further analysis in conjunction with

the Fire Dept., staff is recommending the proposal to close Riverside Ave. be removed, but the remainder of Site Q will remain as a Catalyst Site.

Mr. Colby said staff is recommending that closing Riverside Ave. be removed from the plan based on analysis done by the Fire Dept.

Aldr. Martin made a motion to follow staff recommendation to not close Riverside Ave. (Downtown Catalyst Site Q on p. 68) per the table. Motion seconded by Aldr. Turner.

Roll Call Vote:

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

Nays:

Abstain:

Motion Carried. 8-0.

6. West Gateway photo on p. 71 was used because the former St. Charles Mall site is identified as the most significant redevelopment opportunity in the West Gateway. The picture can be changed.

Aldr. Lemke made a suggestion to use an illustration of Meijer with the pond in front and Lowes next door. Aldr. Lewis thinks that would be positive and maybe a collage coming in from all different ways to the Gateway could be used. Aldr. Lemke said he would defer to that.

Aldr. Lewis made a motion to change the picture for the West Gateway cover on p. 71. Seconded by Aldr. Krieger.

Roll Call Vote:

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

Nays:

Abstain:

Motion Carried. 8-0.

7. Constructing a Fox River bridge near Division Street is not a direct recommendation of the plan, rather the plan identifies an opportunity exists for a bridge in this general location and recommends the issue be studied and considered at some point in the future. The Committee approved a motion to remove the text from p. 22.

Mr. Armstrong said it was not the Task Force's intent to force anything regarding bridges, and given the amount of interest that a bridge would generate and without significant public input, it is probably not a good thing to add into the plan. Vice Chairman said as far as discussion point 7, we are looking to remove it from the plan, but leave the option for at least discussion in some particular area. Mr. Colby said the text that is shown in the comments on page 53 notes that an opportunity exists, and the Committee recommended to take out the text on page 22 under Goals and Objectives.

Aldr. Krieger made a motion to remove the text from p 22. Seconded by Aldr. Silkaitis.

Roll Call Vote:

Ayes: Silkaitis, Payleitner, Lemke, Turner, Bancroft, Martin, Krieger, Lewis
Nays:
Abstain:
Motion Carried. 8-0.

8. The term *Town Center* is used in the three locations, and it would be changed to an alternate term that describes the same type of development:
 - p. 76 Former St. Charles Mall Redevelopment Alternative- *Local Town Center* change to *West Neighborhood Center*
 - p. 76 Concept Legend- *Town Center Mixed Use* change to *Mixed Use*
 - p. 84 Charlestowne Mall repositioning alternatives- *Town Center East* change to *East Town Square*.

Aldr. Lemke said he doesn't know how p. 84 got in here because it causes great confusion, because we are talking about a west side parcel and not renaming Charlestowne Mall in any way Towne Center. Vice Chairman Bessner said he is thinking it's a vague description of what could be Town Center east versus Town Center west. Mr. Colby said the repositioning alternative shown on p. 84 is called *Town Center East*, and it's being proposed to change the name to *East Town Square* since it's based on the square being the center of the development. Aldr. Lemke asked why it can't just be called Charlestowne Mall because it's a fair representation for that area. Ms. Tungare suggested an alternative of calling them options A, B, C. Aldr. Lewis mentioned that during a study recently done it was suggested that the name be changed. Mr. Rabchuk suggested wording it as "the existing Charlestowne Mall", and that way a developer knows they can change the name if they want.

Ms. Penny said the whole idea of the plan is to have flexibility, and she agrees with Ms. Tungare to call it A, B, C and not get into semantics, because we are trying to encourage future people that might have some interest in helping us economically to come in and do something. She said the last thing we want to do is for them to think we will lock them into a name or anything else. Ms. Tungare said the names are just to identify and differentiate between the different concepts; it's not about renaming the mall. Vice Chairman noted that there would also be an Option D for the 4th alternative.

Motion was made by Aldr. Lemke to redefine the alternatives as A, B, C, and to also add a 4th which will be D. Seconded by Silkaitis.

Roll Call Vote:

Ayes: Silkaitis, Payleitner, Lemke, Turner, Bancroft, Martin, Krieger, Lewis
Nays:
Abstain:
Motion Carried. 8-0.

9. Regarding Downtown parking and the catalyst sites on p. 68, additional parking structures are contemplated at Site C (NW quadrant) and Site P (SE quadrant), and the need to accommodate some parking is noted for other sites. However, a general note can be added noting the need to address parking as each site is considered for development and reference back to the text discussing the issue on p. 67 and 54.

Aldr. Martin made a motion to approve the revision as presented in the table. Seconded by Aldr. Krieger.

Roll Call Vote:

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

Nays:

Abstain:

Motion Carried. 8-0.

10. Regarding the West Gateway former St. Charles Mall redevelopment alternatives on p. 76, this area includes catalyst sites H (Jewel), I (Tri-City Center) and J (St. Charles Mall site).

At a minimum, the following changes to Redevelopment Alternatives on p.76 would be necessary:

- #1 *Regional Repositioning*: No changes.
- #2 *Local Town Center*: Change definition of “mixed use” to exclude all residential uses of any type. (“Multi-family/Single Family Attached” is located on Site I- this could remain or be changed to another land use.)
- #3 *Comprehensive Mixed Use Center*: Change definition of “mixed use” to exclude all residential uses; remove references to residential in the “Considerations” section.

Other changes to consider:

- P. 76- Broaden the “mixed use” definition to include other uses. Educational and medical uses were suggested.
- P. 34, 36, 40: These pages reference “potential mixed use” for Sites H, I and J, but recognize the future land use designation of the site is “Corridor/Regional Commercial”. This can remain as is or be removed to eliminate any reference to mixed use at this site.

Mr. Colby showed a marked up slide of what would be changed on p. 76

Aldr. Lemke said the use of “Towne Center” was a concern and needed another name and he doesn’t have any preferences but wanted to call it to attention. Mr. Colby said that was in item 8, the *Local Town Center* would be *West Neighborhood Center* throughout the plan and in the legend where it says *Town Center mixed use*, it would just state *mixed use*.

Aldr. Turner said he thinks saying “no residential” is very short sighted and very regressive to the development of the west side, especially considering the area south of Rt. 38 where Geneva already has residential housing. He said he doesn’t think it will do anybody any good in the long run and if we keep on the route of “no residential” on the site, we may as well keep the vacant picture on the West Gateway because that’s what it will look like. Aldr. Martin asked Aldr. Turner how he knows that, and stated that he did not agree.

Aldr. Krieger said she would like to consider changing the part under “other changes” to consider broadening the mixed use definition because she would not want to eliminate the possibility of education or medical uses, and in considering residential, who is to say a residential rehab center would not be turned away because of it. She said she knows it’s a vision, but she would hate to see possibilities eliminated.

Aldr. Payleitner asked to break it down square by square (each of the three alternatives) and have a discussion and a vote for each. Vice Chairman Bessner agreed.

Mr. Rabchuk asked the Committee to consider that the main purpose is to give flexibility and vision, and once restrictions are put in, it's cutting that down. He said if someone is trying to sell their house, the more restrictions put on the ability to sell it, the opportunity is lessened. Aldr. Martin said he has an option to get in there what he wants instead of some pie in the sky thing that somebody dreamed up. Mr. Rabchuk said it has to be kept in mind that the Council has final say on any plan being proposed and that if all these type of restrictions are added at this point, we are telling developers "we don't even want to talk to you". He said the impact of that type of thinking for this site financially, had it been developed, could have decreased taxes for residents \$1,000 per year and per household, and somebody at some time is going to come before Council to want them to deal with their tax issues. He said the city has done a great job at controlling cost and providing services, but at some point in time these type of sites need to develop and produce income for the city. Aldr. Martin said this site is one of the remaining sites on the west side available for retail and that's what he wants it to be and he stands by that. He said he doesn't want to see apartments or hotels, just commercial retail. Mr. Rabchuk said and the Council controls that, but let developers make a proposal, for example, maybe something like \$3 million townhomes come in that are all sold already generating \$3 million a year in extra tax and 90% of the site will be retail, would Aldr. Martin accept that. Aldr. Martin said no, he would not accept \$3 million townhomes on the property. He said in terms of flexibility of the plan, he has sat up on Council long enough to know that once the plan is approved the staff and everyone else uses it as a guide and to make changes to the plan is very difficult, so why not avoid that to begin with. Mr. Rabchuk said the City used a very top notch urban planning firm to guide us through the process, they know what developers are doing, what other towns are doing to compete with St. Charles, and we are ignoring their advice and the city paid a lot of money for that. Aldr. Martin said that's a matter of opinion and he voted no on it. Mr. Rabchuk said the result is, in looking back at previous plans where urban planners were not used, they are a mess and provided poor or no guidance whatsoever. He said in using professionals to guide us along with the hundreds of people that contributed comments, that the City had an excellent process of gathering input, sorted it all out and came up with what is in front of us. He said to arbitrarily deny that and to say that someone knows more than these experts, that the city paid lots of money for, in his opinion he feels is a poor decision.

Aldr. Payleitner asked Aldr. Martin if he is recommending that there only be plan #1, not the other 2 options. Aldr. Martin said if that is the one that was come up with at the last meeting. Vice Chairman Bessner said he thinks the discussion ended up that there would be 3 options on the table and residential and or mixed use was pulled out of all of them. Mr. Rabchuk said the definition of mixed use was changed to specifically exclude residential. Aldr. Payleitner said options 2 & 3 do not have retail only and she needs clarification from Aldr. Martin. Vice Chairman Bessner noted that even in option 1 there is a small portion that has mixed use. Mr. Rabchuk said the professionals said that the type of retail that would go on the site, because it's not a Randall Rd. site, would have to be supported by some level of residential, but that it doesn't mean it has to be, but it's highly recommended. He mentioned the Towne Center proposal and how Whole Foods was going to build across the street, but they said if the site didn't develop with residential or were to stay an empty space, they would go someplace else, and that's what happened. Aldr. Martin said his opinion is that Rt. 38 is an extremely viable frontage road for any commercial. Mr. Rabchuk said the developers have told us they don't think so and he hopes Aldr. Martin has the funds to develop it.

Aldr. Lemke said there are two corners on the west side where Randall Rd. fronts state highways Rt. 38 and Rt. 64 and in terms of massing and folks driving to Randall Rd. it is because they want to shop at more than one place. He said we were criticized for putting in the Amli parcel, not because Amli people shopped at Jewel, but because it cut out the ability to have retail mass on the east side, and he thinks the same damage would be done if it were assumed that more residential would make the retail development pay off. Mr. Rabchuk said but wouldn't you rather have the option to look at it, and then say no, than to say no upfront and we don't even want to talk about it. Aldr. Lemke said the city has made a decision that the land north of Rt. 38 be retail and good money was spent to allow additional uses in retail. He said the developer knew that when he took money to allow additional retail uses and when he took full interest in the parcel, he knew it was retail, and it was the city's opportunity to have a retail cluster on Randall Rd. and Rt. 38.

Aldr. Lewis asked if the zoning stays the same for the site, because changing it has not been mentioned. Mr. Colby said yes, the property is zoned for commercial use, so for developments to be constructed, particularly options 2 & 3, there would need to be a review process and public hearing process for zoning changes. He said the plan does recommend that a PUD be considered on the site due to its size and complexity. Aldr. Lewis said that last month she asked some questions and also read through some minutes again that there is very strong language that an 8-story complex is not what we are looking for. She said residential over a business was talked about, but not a stand-alone residential building. Mr. Colby said correct, and that is the language highlighted in the mixed use option 3. Aldr. Lewis said she personally feels the hands of the Council, Mayor and Plan Commission, both current and future, should not be tied for developments to come forward, and she feels by not leaving all 3 plans in, they will be doing just that. Aldr. Payleitner suggested more broadened verbiage, maybe multifamily/single family attached in the brown area sounds too restrictive, maybe add other options. Vice Chairman Bessner said the Task Force struggled with that. Mr. Armstrong said one of the things looked at was "what could be legally regulated and what could not" and one thing that could not be was the type of ownership, that's why definitions were not used referring to apartment versus condominiums. He said they did use language that gave direction that showed the type of units that promote home ownership and in the mixed use section we are looking for the flexibility to allow some type of residential use over a commercial or office use on a 2nd or 3rd floor. He said in looking at the mixed use Town Center on the photograph, it's an example of commercial use on the 1st floor but a residential use over it.

Aldr. Payleitner said in looking at the map it says multi family, and Bickford is multifamily, so she is looking for more definition clarity or expansion. Vice Chair Bessner said going through the process he didn't feel their role was to decide what kind of residential product would be there, the closest they got was to look at density levels for the Corporate Reserve property. Aldr. Payleitner said but it does get specific at some points, and she wondered if some examples could be put in there to keep developer options open. Vice Chair Bessner said there would be a number of residential uses out there going from senior housing to the possibility of apartments, but he feels Committee should not promote any particular one, just trying to leave the option open, because there are not developers lining up for these sites and we are not sure if the economy will ever get back to what it was 5-6 years ago. Aldr. Payleitner said we are changing the definition of mixed use according to the recommendation, to exclude residential, and she is

asking if in option 2 if the definition could be added to not limit it. Mr. Armstrong said yes, the Council can define it how the Council sees fit, but he would caution that a consistent definition be used throughout the document, so it does not vary from page to page. Aldr. Payleitner said she agreed, because mixed use is mixed use, and she asked if there is a definition for mixed use anywhere in the plan.

Aldr. Silkaitis said back in the early 2000's when he was on Council, before the housing was on the West Gateway, it was said then that when all that housing was built, it would bring commercial and that did not happen. He said he will not limit the last piece of commercial property on the west side to residential, and he thinks it should be commercial or office. He said he is fine with residential on Bricher, but prime commercial should be all that's allowed for this site.

Aldr. Bancroft said to characterize the site as a prime commercial area is aggressive, and he had no history of the plan so read the plan all weekend long to understand pieces of it. He said on page 6, the final point, and he does respect Aldr. Martin's observation of how it is used historically, states that *the plan serves as an important marketing tool to promote the city's unique assets and advantages*. He said under purpose, it states that at the most basic level, *the plan is intended to direct orderly growth and change as well as maintain and enhance the livability of the city*. He said in his opinion, attempting to forego residential in both mall areas is a mistake, and there is a definition of mixed use on p. 29 and he thinks the definition needs to maintain its current flexibility. He thinks if we want to encourage the best and brightest to bring ideas for these troubled areas, the last thing we want to do, by virtue of something that is supposed to be aspirational, is limit their choices. Aldr. Payleitner said she thinks by limiting our choices based on something that happened 20-years ago is short sided and it needs to be realized that there is a totally different ballgame with the upcoming generation and those options need to be kept open.

Ms. Penny said she supports what some of the Committee is saying and that she was around for the '96 Comprehensive Plan, and yes, residential was supposed to bring commercial, but Geneva got it. She said the last thing we want to do is lock ourselves in, and she feels we were fortunate to have professionals help with the plan for the future, but that it needs to be kept in mind that it's a Comprehensive Plan, not a Zoning Ordinance. She said she feels nothing good comes from fear, and we should not allow ourselves to be afraid of possibilities for the future, because things change and if we shut down the options, we are shutting down viability and possibilities for St. Charles.

Aldr. Lewis said her parents bought a house in St. Charles in 1946 on 11th Ave. and if her parents had said back then they were happy with the way things were and wanted no more residents, most people in the room would not be living here at this time. She said we are not saying we want residential, we are saying this is something we will take a look at, and here is 3 ideas, 3 plans, and she feels that is all it is saying.

Kim Malay-526 S. 16th St.-said if we are going to open it up to any alternative then why was the money spent to do the Comprehensive Plan. She said in all fairness, Aldr. Martin is right, the plan is supposed to give guidance and help staff cut through the proposals that will not go through the Council, and to have a plan that says it will accept just anything to come forward,

what good is it. Aldr. Payleitner said that's not true. Ms. Malay said it leaves the door open to quite a bit and once it's in the plan, and yes the zoning is in place, it was in place back in 2004-2005, but Shodeen came in and did an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan and suddenly residential was an option, and 2 ½ years fighting the project, and the developer was frustrated spending hundreds of thousands of dollars on a project the community didn't want. She said if a project is viable and it's not in the plan, the plan can be amended, but once those 3 options are in the plan it's leading the developers on. Aldr. Payleitner said these are 3 very different ideas. Ms. Malay said exactly, but it's in there so developers are thinking we're open to it, and the City already has the reputation of being hard to deal with, and if residential is what is wanted, then be up front and just say in the plan that we are open to all of it. Aldr. Payleitner said but we are not. Ms. Malay said but you are because once you start with some residential then the doors open. Aldr. Lewis said in looking back at early minutes of the Task Force, there were comments that Ms. Malay was open to some residential. Ms. Malay said the residents did not want residential but she was trying to compromise. Aldr. Lewis said which residents. Ms. Malay said a good majority of them, she had over 300 people. She said there were a lot of people in attendance here and people keep saying that there were hundreds of people saying that we are hard to deal with and that they want residential, and she would like to see that.

Aldr. Payleitner made a suggestion to keep discussion to Committee because there will be an opportunity at the public hearing for residents, and now Committee is just getting distracted. Ms. Malay said she agrees with Aldr. Martin that we are better off to narrow it down and let them come in with an amendment, and the residents are open to everything else but residential. Vice Chair Bessner added that if a developer does come that has a viable idea, that it is a big process to get that turned around in a timely manner. Ms. Malay said it would be a lot quicker than what went on with Shodeen. Vice Chair Bessner said that was a whole different story, the reason it didn't pass had nothing to do with retail or residential, it had to do with the fact that that the Plan Commission came up with a number of units right around 300, he himself suggested 150 units, and there was no meeting in the middle on Shodeen's part, and that's why it didn't pass. He said it was a very viable plan but had height and density issues. Ms. Malay said but it was competing with downtown as well. Vice Chair Bessner said nobody gave him a false sense of allowing him to build 1,000 units. Ms. Malay said that's not what she was told. Vice Chair Bessner said well he was part of the process, so he was there.

Mr. Doyle-member of the Task Force and Plan Commission-said he would like to affirm what Aldr. Martin and Ms. Malay said about clarity in the plan. He said it's important and is a key part of providing fair certainty to developers, that what we say our vision is, we mean it, and we are open to those kinds of developments. He said he thinks that while it is clear to say "no residential" on the property, it's so restrictive and he doesn't think it's the right mission for the city. He said he feels there are some reasons why residential should be included. He said consensus heard at Plan Commission from the public was that big box or strip mall is not what is wanted for this site because it is a catalyst site and he was glad to hear Aldr. Bancroft draw out the part of mixed use pertaining to focus and walkability, because that is the proposition of mixed use development, to have a vibrant lifestyle center where people get out of their cars and shop where they live. He said its transit oriented and is a destination that has character. He said there needs to be limit, so he feels the plan should be clear in terms of the limits, how dense, the ratios, all these things are very important, with some citizen input and the desires of the community, and the Task Force and Plan Commission are both citizen panels whose interests are

not greater and no less than any other member of the community that provides testimony. He said in 2010 the Plan Commission made a unanimous recommendation to establish a mixed use district on this parcel, but the PUD was split because of density issues. He said that recommendation has been upheld by the Task Force and the Comprehensive Plan and supported by workshops, consultants, and paid staff, so he is asking that Committee pay close attention to the aspects of the vision that is being recommended in the plan and understand what the value of the proposition is. He asked that Committee consider it sincerely as it moves to Council.

Aldr. Turner asked if in making a motion it would be to keep the plan as is, or vote on multiple changes. Vice Chair Bessner said he thinks there is an option to vote for discussion point 10 with whatever direction, either keep mixed use as it, to include residential or not to, or as Aldr. Payleitner said, to address each particular alternative.

Aldr. Krieger asked if item 10 is disregarded, will that eliminate any future educational or medical uses there. She doesn't want to throw out those possibilities. Mr. Colby said it would not specifically be excluded, but if the Committee wanted that identified here, it could be identified as a part of mixed use. Aldr. Krieger thinks that's important. Vice Chair Bessner said that should be stated now that medical and educational remain part of mixed use. Aldr. Payleitner clarified that the change would be in the definition for mixed use on p. 29. Aldr. Martin said given the discussion had, that to make that type of motion as opposed to his position, to solid commercial, is unproductive and is going to result in some negative reactions. He said he supposes it's time to compromise and he thinks to give the commercial retail site vision an opportunity to produce and if not go to plan B (2nd alternative) and he would also like to add that any construction is limited to 3-stories. Vice Chair Bessner asked if that number is currently at 6. Ms. Tungare said she did not think there was a number included in the plan. Aldr. Lemke said he would be in support of that because the problems in the past were the high elevations proposed, but he doesn't understand where it's decided that option A hasn't worked. Aldr. Turner said he cannot accept Aldr. Martin's compromise because we don't know when it starts, ends, and what if B comes first.

Vice Chair Bessner said if the height were to be added into the motion, it would need to be discussed as a Committee. Aldr. Lewis suggested not using the word limit, but maybe a suggested or preferred height. Ms. Tungare said the plan will not regulate height, it's going to give direction, and the zoning will regulate the height. She said either "prefer" or "limit" would work, it just gives direction to then translate into zoning regulations. Vice Chair Bessner asked if "height to not exceed what's currently in the city" would work. Aldr. Bancroft said he goes back again to the mixed use definition which states that the areas be characterized by uses and development patterns that provide a vibrant, safe, attractive and walkable pedestrian environment. He said in adding a reference to height, he doesn't think it should be specific; it should just be of a character in height consistent with making it walkable. Vice Chair Bessner suggest saying something like "conscious of height".

Aldr. Turner made a motion to disregard item 10 in the table, broaden the mixed use definition on p. 29 to include educational and medical, and also state to be "conscious of height". Motion seconded by Aldr. Bancroft.

Roll Call Vote:

Ayes: Payleitner, Turner, Bancroft, Krieger, Lewis

Nays: Silkaitis, Lemke, Martin
Abstain:
Motion Carried. 5-3.

11. Regarding the Charlestowne Mall framework plan on p. 83:

At a minimum, the following changes to the Framework Plan on p. 83 would be necessary:

“Single Family Residential” will be removed from the plan on p. 83. Stormwater basins on the north side of the mall site will be shown on the plan. The screening buffer north of the Mall can be shifted further north to the Mall property line. The northwest section of the Oliver-Hoffmann site will be shown as “Outlot Commercial, Retail and Office Development”, consistent with the other sites around the mall building.

Change to citywide Land Use Plan on p. 30: Revise the Land Use Plan to match the revisions to the Charlestowne Mall Framework Plan.

Other change to consider: P. 34, 36, 40: These pages reference “potential mixed use” for the Charlestowne Mall site, but recognize the future land use designation of the site is “Corridor/Regional Commercial.” This can remain as is or be removed to eliminate any reference to mixed use at this site.

Mr. Colby showed a diagram depicting the changes to the land uses on the framework plan.

Aldr. Krieger asked if by adding the medical and educational to p. 29, would that now be included here as well, because if not she would like to see that added. Mr. Colby said it could be added under the outlot commercial and retail development category or it could also be indicated for the mall building. Aldr. Martin asked if in regard to the medical/education, if they would pay taxes. Vice Chair Bessner said it would probably vary based on the size of the institution or the property being discussed versus commercial retail. Aldr. Martin said what if a college wants to take the whole site. Vice Chair Bessner said that would be something to consider. Aldr. Martin said that’s a big consideration. Aldr. Turner said it could be a private school too, they pay taxes. Aldr. Lewis said her opinion would maybe be to open an option to take a small portion of the property and there probably would not be tax dollars if it were a state type of educational facility, but employees would be spending money in the surrounding retail and get tax dollars that way, but she doesn’t think anyone was thinking the whole parcel would be a college. Aldr. Martin said it’s a possibility.

Aldr. Lemke made a motion to take the point as presented in the table with the exclusion of city land use from the Charlestowne Mall plan and mixed use. There was no second.

Aldr. Turner said so remove all residential. Aldr. Lemke said yes, he thought that was decided last time. Aldr. Turner said he can see removing the single family homes but other than that he would leave the residential and mixed use in for the same reasons here as the west side. Aldr. Lemke said it would remove the detention and the berms and he is not sure what the benefit of that is. Aldr. Turner said we would keep the removal of the single family residential and maintain Oliver Hoffman, and he thinks mixed use should stay on the parcel as well. Aldr. Lemke clarified that the extent of residential would be Oliver Hoffman only. Vice Chair Bessner asked if the option of mixed use would be left in. Aldr. Turner said he would leave it in. Aldr. Lemke said there should be a vote. Aldr. Payleitner asked where the mixed use would be. Mr. Colby said it’s on the main land use plan, it’s not detailed in the framework plan. He said this

page is an excerpt from the commercial area framework plan which shows both mall sites as a future land use of Corridor/Regional Commercial and was identified as Potential Mixed Use.

Aldr. Turner made a motion to remove single family residential (p. 83), residential for Oliver Hoffman consent decree stays (p. 83), maintain mixed use with a medical and education component (p. 34, 36, 40). Seconded by Aldr. Bancroft.

Aldr. Martin made a motion to amend the motion to remove medical and educational from the motion.

Aldr. Payleitner said wait, we have already changed the definition for mixed use throughout the plan, which now has education and medical use in it.

Mayor Rogina noted that the amended motion needed to be voted on first, before the original motion.

Aldr. Lemke amended the motion to exclude mixed use. Seconded by Aldr. Martin.

Roll Call Vote:

Ayes: Silkaitis, Lemke, Martin
Nays: Payleitner, Turner, Bancroft, Krieger, Lewis
Abstain:
Motion to amend failed. 3-5.

The Committee then voted on Aldr. Turner's original motion to remove single family residential (p. 83), residential for Oliver Hoffman consent decree stays (p. 83), maintain mixed use with a medical and education component (p. 34, 36, 40). Seconded by Aldr. Bancroft.

Roll Call Vote:

Ayes: Payleitner, Turner, Bancroft, Krieger, Lewis
Nays: Silkaitis, Lemke, Martin
Abstain:
Motion Carried. 5-3

12. Add a Table of Contents and word index to the document.

Aldr. Turner made a motion to add a table of contents and word index to the document. Seconded by Aldr. Lemke.

Roll Call Vote:

Ayes: Silkaitis, Payleitner, Lemke, Turner, Bancroft, Martin, Krieger, Lewis
Nays:
Abstain:
Motion Carried. 8-0.

Ms. Tungare said she thinks staff already has the recommendation but it wouldn't hurt to make one comprehensive recommendation to forward the plan to City Council for Public Hearing.

Aldr. Turner made a motion to forward the City of St. Charles Comprehensive Plan out of Committee and on to the City Council for Public Hearing. Seconded by Aldr. Krieger.

Roll Call Vote:

Ayes: Silkaitis, Payleitner, Lemke, Turner, Bancroft, Krieger, Lewis
Nays: Martin
Abstain:
Motion Carried. 7-1

Mr. Colby stated the earliest the Public Hearing could be set would be August 5, 2013, which would depend on whether the Committee would like the plan revised prior to the public hearing, or go to public hearing with the current plan along with updated tables from Plan Commission and P&D Committee, which would be a more timely approach.

Aldr. Lewis said she personally would like to see an updated plan at the Public Hearing.

Vice Chairman Bessner asked if there would be a chance that there would be more modifications after the Public Hearing. Mr. Colby said it's possible. Aldr. Krieger said if there will be more changes, it would be best to go off of the tables rather than printing the plan twice. Ms. Tungare added it's an additional cost as well. Aldr. Lewis said she was fine with the tables.

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

6. ADDITIONAL BUSINESS-None.

7. ADJOURNMENT-Aldr. Martin made a motion to adjourn. Seconded by Aldr. Turner at 9:17pm.