

CITY OF WARRENVILLE  
PLAN COMMISSION/ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS  
Minutes of Regular Meeting (*via Zoom*)  
Held on Thursday, February 4, 2021

A. CALL TO ORDER

Plan Commission Ch. Cosgrove called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. Ch. Cosgrove explained the two opportunities interested parties would have to provide remarks: (i) public comments and questions during the public hearing would be accepted after the applicant's presentation and Commission's questions, and (ii) the Citizens' Comments item of the agenda.

Per Ch. Cosgrove's request, Pl. Domovessova explained the Citizens' Comments portion of the virtual meeting protocol, including how public comment would be accepted via Zoom and call in, which would include:

1. Public comment from anyone at City Hall;
2. Public comment from anyone participating in the meeting via Zoom with camera; and
3. Public comment from anyone participating in the meeting via phone.

Pl. Domovessova explained all meeting participants should stay muted until they are asked to provide their comment, and start their comment by announcing their name and address. Emailed public comments received prior to the meeting would be read aloud following verbal comments. (No public comments were received electronically prior to commencement of the meeting.) Individual Commissioner's comments would follow. Commissioners and staff members wishing to speak were asked to raise their hand, and wait for their name to be called. Where applicable, presentation materials are available on the City's website.

B. ROLL CALL

PC Present: Tim Cosgrove, John Davis, Robert Pepple, John Lockett, Byron Miller, Jessica Tullier, Kevin Leonard, Elizabeth Chapman

PC Excused/Absent: Shannon Burns

ZBA Present: Tim Cosgrove, John Davis, Robert Pepple, Jonathan Lockett, Byron Miller, Elizabeth Chapman

ZBA Excused/Absent: Shannon Burns

Also Present: Mayor David Brummel, Community and Economic Development Director Ron Mentzer, Sr. Planner Natalia Domovessova, Planner Lauren Whetstone, Recording Secretary Marie Lupo, Consulting Engineer Thomas Adomshick

C. PUBLIC HEARING

1. 28301 Ferry Road / Vintage Luxury Homes  
Located west of Winfield Road, on the south side of Ferry Road  
Project No. 2021-0011  
Request for the following special approvals, which together would allow for Vintage Luxury Homes' redevelopment of an approximately 4.63-acre section of existing surface parking lot with a 10-building, 57-unit, townhouse complex and related surface parking, lighting, and landscaping improvements and repurposing the existing 139,900-square foot three-story vacant office building for a co-op shared office space:
  - a. Revised Preliminary/Final Plat of Subdivision of Cantera Subarea E, Lot E-1;

- b. Major Amendments to the Cantera General Site Plan Documents and Cantera Development Control Regulations to add “Multi-Family Use Area” to the list of uses permitted within Cantera Subarea E;
- c. Re-designation of an approximately 4.63-acre area of Cantera Subarea E from an Office Park Use Area to a Multi-Family Use Area;
- d. Major Planned Unit Development Amendment for a revised Preliminary Planned Unit Development Special Use Permit for Subarea E;
- e. Revised Preliminary Planned Unit Development for the 14.8-acre office lot;
- f. Preliminary Planned Unit Development and various Site Specific Amendment to the Cantera Development Control Regulations for the 4.63-acre residential lot; and
- g. Any other site specific or general amendments to the Cantera Development Control Regulations, General Site Plan Documents, or site specific amendments to the Warrenville Zoning Ordinance that may be required for this project.

For the benefit of the audience, Ch. Cosgrove provided a brief introduction to the request and explained the public hearing process that would ensue. The Applicant confirmed he submitted proof of lawful notice in the form of certified mail return receipts to Recording Secretary Lupo prior to the hearing. Ch. Cosgrove assured the assembly that both the Commission and the general public would have an opportunity to ask questions and/or provide comments on the project after the Applicant’s presentation.

Given the complexity of the regulatory structure in Cantera, and for the benefit of new Plan Commission members, Dir. Mentzer provided a presentation that briefly summarized the Cantera Development Control Regulations and Master Plan, and how these plans relate to the request, as follows:

#### Key Aspects of the Regulatory Structure of the Cantera Project:

- Underlying Zoning –Special Development (SD) District (only one property is zoned SD)  
Minimum Land Area
- PUD Requirements  
Mandatory  
Public Hearing is required  
Zoning flexibility in exchange for higher standard of design and amenity
- General Site Plan Documents  
Required for PUD’s in SD District  
Cantera developed and approved in early 1990s  
Includes the Cantera Development Control Regulations

#### Cantera Development Control Regulations:

- Functions as the Zoning, Landscape and Sign Ordinance for Cantera
- Supersedes standard City ordinance requirements
- Regulates:
  - Land Use
  - Lot size
  - Building and parking setbacks
  - Parking requirements

Landscaping  
Signs  
Lighting

## Land Use Regulation in Cantera: Land Use Designations Vs. Zoning Districts

**General Site Plan: Exhibit A**

PARCEL DESIGNATION	USE AREAS PERMITTED WITHIN PARCEL
A	Single Family Use Area
B	Multi-Family Use Area
C	Transitional Office Use Area
D	Office Park Use Area
E	Commercial Center Use Area
F	Special Residential Use Area
G	Institutional Use Area
H	Office Park Use Area
I	Light Industrial Park Use Area
J	Commercial Center Use Area
K	Light Industrial Park Use Area

  

USE AREA DESIGNATIONS	MIN. SIZE REQUIRED
1. Office Park Use Areas	20 Acres
2. Light Industrial Park Use Areas	20 Acres
3. Commercial Center Use Areas	10 Acres
4. Institutional Use Areas	10 Acres
5. Large Facility Use Areas	15 Acres
6. Transitional Office Use Areas	2.4 Acres
7. Single Family Use Areas	20 Acres
8. Multi-Family Use Areas	20 Acres
9. Special Residential Use Areas	10 Acres

**Other Key Elements of Cantera Development Control Regulations:**

- Front setbacks measured to centerline of streets and vary depending on the Land Use Designation and type of street
- Extensive landscape requirements
- Some architectural requirements
- Site Specific Amendments and Site Specific Exceptions
- Minor versus Major PUD Amendments
- Very “suburban” in nature
  - Separate land uses into big blocks
  - Very auto oriented

COM. PEPPLE MOVED, SECONDED BY COM. TULLIER, TO OPEN THE PUBLIC HEARING.

**ROLL CALL VOTE:**

Aye: Cosgrove, Davis, Peple, Chapman, Lockett, Miller, Tullier  
 Nay: None  
 Absent/Excused: Burns, Leonard (Leonard was having a connection problem)

MOTION ADOPTED UNANIMOUSLY.

Haeger Engineering LLC Vice President Mike Anderson of Schaumburg, Illinois and Vintage Luxury Homes’ owner Joe Elias of South Barrington, Illinois were duly sworn in by Recording

Secretary Lupo and directed attention to a PowerPoint presentation that showed the proposed front elevation of the townhomes, site plan, landscape plan, floor plans, and cross section.

Mr. Elias summarized the proposal, as rejuvenating a currently vacant 139,000-square foot former BP Amoco training site into maintenance-free, luxury, urban-style rowhomes and a shared co-op workspace office building—providing a “Live-Work-Play” lifestyle alternative for Warrenville, which in his opinion is the wave of the future. The townhome price point range is \$400,000-\$450,000. The building exterior consists of natural stone, brick, and decorative stucco. He stated the development across Ferry Road will benefit from this development. He acknowledged receipt of the staff report.

Mr. Anderson stated a parking study has not yet been prepared; however, he feels the site is over-parked for an office use. He is aware of the different parking level requirements for townhome and office uses; however, hopes for synergy between the two land uses, as they are complimentary in “work hours” versus “non-work hours.”

Mr. Elias stated his company runs and operates several co-working facilities, two of which are suburban, located in Elk Grove Village and Deer Park, as well as an urban West Loop location. None of these sites operate under a traditional 9:00-5:00 workday. The culture of the co-working industry is vastly different than typical office spaces, as the daily mass entrance/exit of vehicles is non-existent. Parking lots are often under-utilized because space is provided for a company with ten employees; however, only two or three employees are typically on site at a given time, because employees trade off shifts and days. Parking ratios in Vintage’s existing suburban locations range from 2-4 spaces per 1,000 square feet, and are still underutilized.

Ch. Cosgrove expressed his view that a parking study would be necessary; Mr. Elias agreed to have a study prepared. Ch. Cosgrove also reiterated the staff report’s requirement for a traffic analysis as it relates to anticipated traffic patterns and projections, including a fire truck turning radius exhibit. Also required is a detailed preliminary PUD landscape plan. Although Mr. Elias stated a final landscape plan would be submitted with final architectural plans, he agreed to prepare them at this time.

Mr. Elias offered a justification for the requested shortened setback variances as being consistent with that of the proposed urban style of the development, which provides a walk-up feel.

Com. Davis expressed favor with the upscale architecture of the row house proposal. However, he questioned the distance to parking availability, especially given the price point of the townhomes. Although two garage spaces are provided, owners do not have an apron on which to park, nor nearby street parking. Storage in garages is not an option for two-car residents. Mr. Elias replied the proposal provides an urban feel, wherein buyers of such mindset would not be opposed to walking a short distance to park. Some street parking is provided. He agreed to provide several area addresses similar in concept to the proposal.

Com. Davis inquired as to the amount of time the applicant would require to submit missing required supplemental information; Mr. Elias replied approximately two weeks would be necessary—although he was hoping to obtain preliminary approval at this point. He envisioned that architectural building plans would be submitted separately as a building permit, and the

already submitted landscape plan would be adequate to show good faith in creating a park-like setting with ample landscaping commensurate with luxury homes. Com. Davis responded that given the requested number of variance requests, the Commission finds it difficult to recommend pre-approval of the project's layout, which may have to be altered. Mr. Elias directed attention to the exhibits he submitted with the request, which should answer some of the Commission's qualms.

Ch. Cosgrove inquired whether the buildings would encroach into the existing landscape plan along Ferry Road; Mr. Elias replied they would not. Pl. Domovessova stated Ferry Road landscaping is consistent with the streetscape throughout Cantera. However, in December the applicant removed trees in front of the property. Staff requests a detailed landscape plan that illustrates how the proposed landscaping in this section of Ferry Road would both (i) address tree replacements, and (ii) fit into the design for the remainder of Ferry Road frontage. As it is a different type of development than that of a typical office building or parking lot, this design must highlight its residential development.

Mr. Elias replied that due to the over 125 dead trees attributable to Emerald ash borer disease on the property, which neither the Cantera Owner's Association (COA) nor the previous owner removed or trimmed, extensive tree removal was required to remedy the unsightly appearance of the property. (The COA stated they had not yet gotten to said area of Cantera in its tree removal/replacement project.) Mr. Elias said he plans to replace removed trees and restore the site's landscaping better than that which had previously existed, complementing the new development across the street. The foundation landscape plan is illustrated. A sidewalk will be added to the greenspace along Ferry Road. Mr. Elias assured the Commission of his expertise in landscaping, as he owned one of the largest landscape companies in northern Illinois for 30+ years.

Com. Pepple requested clarification of the discrepancy between the original 2013 land title survey showing parking lot access in two locations, and the proposed drawing, which shows access is closed with a block and chain access barricade between the property to the east. Mr. Elias replied the previous owner put up a chain barricade to discourage overnight parking and trespassers. Com. Pepple expressed concern over the site having only one access point, and the inadequate amount parking. He interprets "urban parking" as parking in a garage. He felt residents would have to walk too long a distance to park—especially while carrying groceries. Additionally, he anticipates that some residents may park at the edge of the east neighboring site's parking lot. He also felt additional greenery should be added to the north. He awaits receipt of the aforementioned studies and plans that were not yet undertaken. That said, he is in favor of the row homes' appearance.

Com. Miller commented on the market study's prime target being that of 25-45 year old residents. As this is typically the age for having a family, he requested the applicant expound upon how children would fit into the development, and the school district that would serve the development. He stated the nearest park is McDowell Woods, which is across the expressway, and inquired where children would play.

Mr. Elias replied it is difficult to predict amount of children. Row homes will offer three and four-bedroom units. Large park areas exist between two sets of row homes, and paths lead to the

gazebo and park in the middle of the two sets of buildings. It is a transparent concept; potential buyers will acknowledge the lack of back yard, and urban environment, without it being that of a typical apartment building.

Com. Miller replied this would require parents having to accompany children each time they venture out, and in his opinion, it is inadequate. He respectfully requested additional information on this aspect of the development. That said, he favored the architecture and interior layout of the floor plans.

Mr. Anderson confirmed School District 203 would serve the area, boundaries of which extend north of the development.

Com. Lockett inquired as to the reason the row homes' orientation was changed since the Courtesy Review before the Commission; Mr. Elias replied the revision complied with staff's recommendation, based on the comment that the initial configuration "resembled army barracks." Dir. Mentzer commented the initial proposal consisted of identical-sized buildings that in staff's opinion were not aesthetically appealing from the roadway.

Com. Lockett commented the transition from parking lot to residential landscaping and lighting may be challenging. He inquired whether the units would be handicap accessible. Mr. Elias replied because they are owned units and not rental, they would not be handicap accessible; however, if someone had a special request, it could be accommodated. Residential lifts can be retrofitted after construction. They take up little space, are easily installed, and economical. He agreed to provide examples. Com. Lockett complimented the applicant on the architecture, and agreed that the concept coincided with future trends.

Com. Tullier was in favor of the site plan layout, wherein the buildings face Ferry Road for a view. She inquired as to the variety of bedroom units in each building. Mr. Elias replied each building had the same amount.

Mr. Anderson stated new water main is being routed along the site and hydrants will be added as required by the Code. They did not consider a cross easement parking agreement with the neighbor to the east due to the potential for liability issues. The current cross-through locations were retained to avoid a redesign of access points.

Com. Chapman concurred with most of the Commission's comments. She informed Com. Miller that Cerny Park is within walking distance and would not require crossing an expressway. In addition, the school is nearby. She expressed concern over site circulation for ambulances and fire trucks. Mr. Elias replied he would address these issues with a traffic and access study. A stoplight exists with double access to the site, with two lanes entering and two lanes exiting.

Ch. Davis inquired as to the location of HVAC equipment. Mr. Elias replied there are areas on both ends and compressors can be situated on the rooftop.

Mr. Elias shared his philosophy of owing a condominium versus a townhome. He feels the days of owning a condominium in the suburbs are short lived and there is not a market for this. Apartments that were converted into condominiums are being reconverted into apartments again.

Com. Cosgrove inquired as to the solar components of the project. Mr. Elias replied his company is continually addressing new technology and efficiencies like spray foam insulation, LED lighting and solar panels. In particular, Generac and Tesla have developed a residential use solar panel package that appears to be easily retro-fit into homes, but it is not yet tested. He is confident that such product could potentially be placed into units to offer an alternative energy source.

Com. Cosgrove stated that among the feedback from the Courtesy Review was that the project was too dense—yet only three units were removed. Mr. Elias responded that the layout was changed, per City staff and Commission request. He stressed the importance of symmetry, and felt an urban style development is founded on density. He was not opposed to eliminating units; however, his goal is to achieve balance and architectural style that can withstand time. Com. Cosgrove then inquired what the most popular units typically would be; Mr. Elias replied the end units are most popular. Com. Cosgrove stated this was precisely the point, suggesting the importance and value of space, especially for children to play. Mr. Elias commented that the end units are indeed desirable—but also the most expensive. If the design was changed, it would become a townhome development. This is a different type of product introduced to Warrenville, the character and style of which they hope to retain.

Com. Miller inquired as to the east setback; Mr. Anderson replied it is 25 feet from the property line to the building, instead of the required 30 feet.

COM. PEPPLER MOVED, SECONDED BY COM. CHAPMAN, TO CONTINUE THE PUBLIC HEARING UNTIL MARCH 18, 2021.

ROLL CALL VOTE:

Aye: Cosgrove, Davis, Pepple, Lockett, Chapman, Miller, Tullier, Leonard

Nay: None

Absent/Excused: Burns

Com. Miller expressed his opinion that he is uncomfortable with the idea of an urban development in Warrenville, as it is not the City's style.

Com. Davis was in favor of the urban concept, and making an unused parking space productive. He felt plenty of people would like the urban lifestyle and location off of a major interchange. He supported the project assuming hurdles are overcome.

*For specific details of this public hearing presentation and discussion, please refer to the Zoom recording, which is available for viewing in the City of Warrenville's website here: <https://www.warrenville.il.us/802/Vintage-Luxury-Homes>*

D. CITIZENS' COMMENTS

None.

E. COURTESY REVIEW

1. 2S260 Riverside Pkwy / Kristin and Sean Blumenschein  
 Located on the west side of Riverside Parkway, south of Forestview Drive North  
 Potential request for approval of Zoning Ordinance variations that would allow a 1,770-square foot single-family home building addition to encroach into the required front and side-yard setbacks in the R-2 Zoning District.

Kristin and Sean Blumenschein addressed the Commission and directed attention to a presentation regarding their request to build a home addition on their rather narrow 1.3-acre lot. It included a history beginning with their May 2010 home purchase, first flood in July 2010, and garage flooding an average of one to two times per year during the subsequent 10 years, due to the yard’s runoff draining into the garage. The 100-year flood plain is at 702 feet; the garage elevation is approximately 697 feet. During the flood of 2013, they received 17 inches of water in the house. In 2014, they raised the house out of the floodplain to be in Zone X; however, they did not remodel or relocate the detached garage due to finances.

Following years of flooding, the Blumenscheins must replace the garage structure due to water damage to all portions of the structure, and mold. They face the following two options to remedy the situation:

- (a) Rebuild the garage on the south side of the property (in the floodplain). Although this would provide a new, safe structure, the following downsides should be considered:
  - DuPage County will not grant the compensatory storage to elevate out of the floodplain;
  - The structure would continue to flood and deteriorate at a faster rate; and
  - No increase in house value for the investment.
- (b) Build an addition to attach the garage to the house out of the floodplain (approval of variance is required) and second-floor livable space. This would provide a new, safe structure that does not flood, which provides storage on ground level (no compensatory storage required). In addition, the additional livable space increases the home value.

The Commission was asked to consider the following Blumenschein concerns and the responses:

Variance required on north side of property	Neighbors to the north have previewed the plans and agreed to minimum of three feet from property line
Variance required to the street	There is a precedence for variance approval set by 2S250 Riverside Parkway (neighbor to north)
Height of the addition	The height will match/not exceed the existing structure
Additional water runoff	The addition will not increase the water runoff
Square footage of the driveway	The move will eliminate a significant amount of driveway that currently cuts through the floodplain
Environmental impact	Demolition of current garage will remove a structure from the floodplain

Impact to neighboring properties    House size will be similar to others on the same street

The Blumenscheins provided examples of five other Riverside Parkway homes that illustrate their proposed addition would result in a house of similar size to surrounding houses, and would not be the largest on the block.

Ms. Blumenschein stated that adding onto the front of the home would not be feasible because the lower-level egress windows present an obstacle.

Ch. Cosgrove suggested reducing the width of the garage, as the side yard setback would be an issue. He stated a tandem garage would allow for extra storage. Com. Davis concurred that the garage width could be reduced by four feet, and a 16-foot wide door could be installed. The garage has the greatest impact on the existing structure. He suggested the applicants should develop more details on what they want to accomplish, as the submitted hand-drawn floor plan was vague. Interior spaces be designed according to side yard setbacks.

Mr. Blumenschein stated they already paid \$6,000 out of pocket for compensatory storage, and DuPage County did not reimburse them. He did not want to spend an additional \$9,000 to have an architect draw up a more detailed plan before this courtesy review provided some direction. He requested feedback on the possibility of having a three-foot encroachment.

Ch. Cosgrove replied he would not recommend anything less than an eight-foot setback. Com. Chapman concurred, and felt there were other ways to approach the situation. Com. Lockett expressed no issues with the front setback, but felt the side yard setback was an issue. Com. Pepple concurred and felt the Blumenscheins were creating their own problem with adding an addition, and would not be in favor of any setback less than eight feet. Com. Miller expressed sympathy with the flood plain issue; however, he felt a three-foot setback was too small. He would, however, entertain a six-foot setback.

Com. Davis commented that the addition was substantial, and should maintain proportion. He could support a seven-foot side yard setback. A three-foot side yard setback may present maintenance problems for the neighbor. Mr. Blumenschein replied he already spoke with the neighbor and he did not have a problem with a three-foot setback. Com. Miller replied that neighbors change. He suggested an easement.

Ch. Cosgrove summarized the Blumenscheins should get as close to an eight-foot side yard setback as possible, and the front yard setback had no issues.

#### F. OTHER BUSINESS

1. Plan Commission/Zoning Board of Appeals
  - a. Nomination and election of Plan Commission Vice-Chairman

Having duly nominated Com. Pepple, and Com. Pepple having accepted such nomination, CH. COSGROVE MOVED, SECONDED BY COM. LOCKETT, TO ELECT COM. PEPPLER AS PLAN COMMISSION VICE CHAIRMAN.

ROLL CALL VOTE:

Aye: Cosgrove, Davis, Pepple, Lockett, Miller, Tullier, Leonard, Chapman  
Nay: None  
Absent/Excused: Burns

MOTION ADOPTED UNANIMOUSLY.

b. Nomination and election of Zoning Board of Appeals Chairman

Having duly nominated Ch. Cosgrove and Ch. Cosgrove having accepted such nomination, COM. Pepple MOVED, SECONDED BY COM. Chapman, TO ELECT CH. COSGROVE AS ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS CHAIRMAN.

ROLL CALL VOTE:

Aye: Cosgrove, Davis, Pepple, Lockett, Miller, Tullier, Leonard, Chapman  
Nay: None  
Absent/Excused: Burns

MOTION ADOPTED UNANIMOUSLY.

c. Nomination and election of Zoning Board of Appeals Vice-Chairman

Ch. Cosgrove announced this nomination and election was accomplished at the last meeting.

d. Nomination and election of Plan Commission Secretary

Having duly nominated Com. Lockett and Com. Lockett having accepted such nomination, CH. COSGROVE MOVED, SECONDED BY COM. PEPPLE, TO ELECT COM. LOCKETT AS PLAN COMMISSION SECRETARY.

ROLL CALL VOTE:

Aye: Cosgrove, Davis, Pepple, Lockett, Miller, Tullier, Leonard, Chapman  
Nay: None  
Absent/Excused: Burns

MOTION ADOPTED UNANIMOUSLY.

2. Warrenville Trailhead Project Update

Com. Pepple provided an update on the Trailhead project, which originated in 2016. Final designs are taking form. The parking lot will remain the same; another building will be added. A circular area if trees will serve as an activity are; a founders' memorial area will be designed in a railroad track manner. Also included is a brick seating area. The Lexington Trace project donated amounts of fill from their townhome project that City staff levelled out and utilized to make room for two restrooms and the building, which will have limited heating of 40-50 degrees. This project did not cost the City anything, other than City staff time to complete, as the grading plans were initially included with the Trailhead project. The target completion is 2022. The City will maintain it after it is completed.

3. Plan Commission/Zoning Board of Appeals Tips and Recommendations for Efficient and Professional Meetings

Dir. Mentzer stated that if Commissioners have questions or concerns on the distributed materials, they are to give Pl. Domovessova or himself a call.

G. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

1. Regular Meeting of January 7, 2021

CH. COSGROVE MOVED, SECONDED BY COM. DAVIS, TO APPROVE THE JANUARY 7, 2021, MINUTES, WITH THE FOLLOWING CHANGES:

- Page 2, Paragraph 8, Line 1 - Insert “who told him that the building owner” after “Fontana.”
- Page 3, Paragraph 3 – Change eight to eighteen.

ROLL CALL VOTE:

Aye: Cosgrove, Davis, Pepple, Lockett, Chapman, Miller, Tullier, Leonard

Nay: None

Absent/Excused: Burns

MOTION ADOPTED UNANIMOUSLY.

H. CITIZENS’ COMMENTS

There were no comments or emails from the public.

I. CHAIRMAN’S REPORT

No report.

J. COMMUNITY AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR’S REPORT

Dir. Mentzer reported Planner Lauren Whetstone submitted her resignation. He and the Commission wished her well.

K. SR. PLANNER’S REPORT

No report.

L. ADJOURN

COM. LOCKETT MOVED, SECONDED BY COM. CHAPMAN, TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 9:19 P.M.

ROLL CALL VOTE:

Aye: Cosgrove, Davis, Pepple, Chapman, Lockett, Miller, Tullier, Leonard

Nay: None  
Absent/Excused: Burns

MOTION ADOPTED UNANIMOUSLY.

---

Marie Lupo, Recording Secretary