

CITY OF WARRENVILLE
PLAN COMMISSION/ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS
Minutes of Regular Meeting (*via GoToMeeting*)
Held on Thursday, March 18, 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 GoToMeeting and call in, which would include:

1. Public comment from anyone at City Hall;
2. Public comment from anyone participating in the meeting via GoToMeeting 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. One public comment from the DuPage Forest Preserve was received electronically prior to commencement of the meeting and was shared with the Plan Commission. 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, Robert Pepple, John Lockett, Byron Miller, Jessica Tullier, Shannon Burns

PC Excused/Absent: Elizabeth Chapman, John Davis, Kevin Leonard

ZBA Present: Tim Cosgrove, Robert Pepple, Jonathan Lockett, Byron Miller, Shannon Burns

ZBA Excused/Absent: Elizabeth Chapman, John Davis

Also Present: Community and Economic Development Director Ron Mentzer, Sr. Planner Natalia Domovessova, 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.

COM. PEPPLE MOVED, SECONDED BY COM. MILLER, TO CONTINUE THE PUBLIC HEARING.

ROLL CALL VOTE:

Aye: Cosgrove, Pepple, Lockett, Miller, Tullier, Burns

Nay: None

Absent/Excused: Chapman, Davis, Leonard

MOTION ADOPTED UNANIMOUSLY.

Per Ch. Cosgrove’s request, Dir. Mentzer provided a brief history of the Cantera Development Control Regulations (DCR), which were established nearly 30 years ago between the City and the master developer, and serve as the “zoning ordinance” for Cantera. At the time of adoption, the DCRs were considered state of the art; however, as the market and development have evolved, the DCRs are now considered old school zoning regulations. In essence, Cantera consists of big blocks of the same type of land use separated from different types of land uses, with large setbacks and bountiful automobile parking, and having buildings not oriented toward the streetscape. In today’s market, it does not present an attractive environment, as it is considered an inefficient and uneconomical use of valuable land. Office complexes are currently experiencing redevelopment into mixed use models. An example is Hoffman Estates’ former Sears complex’s redevelopment into housing and retail uses, which complement each other.

Per Ch. Cosgrove’s request, Pl. Domovessova summarized each of the nine variance requests in a presentation.

Recording Secretary Lupo duly swore in the following individuals: Vintage Luxury Homes' owner Joe Elias of South Barrington, Illinois, Haeger Engineering LLC Vice President Mike Anderson of Schaumburg, Illinois, Traffic Engineer Brendan May of KLOA in Rosemont, Illinois, and Laube Consulting Group's Michael Laube of Chicago, Illinois.

After Mr. Elias clarified this was a *new* public hearing, instead of a *continued* public hearing, he summarized the proposal for the 18-acre parcel in a PowerPoint presentation, which he feels would rejuvenate the vacant, 136,000-square foot former BP Training Center into a live-work-play model by coupling the remodeled shared work space with 48 luxury, urban-style row homes. This lifestyle alternative would bring new business into the area and benefit the future retail space across from the development. Businesses struggling from the pandemic, such as restaurants and entertainment venues, would be assisted and would also contribute to the urban feel of the project. Row homes would be priced in the \$400,000-\$450,000 range, and consist of stone, brick, metal, and stucco, with carriage-style garage doors and wood trim.

Mr. Elias stated all comments from the February 4, 2021, public hearing were addressed—most notably that of the reduction in total number of row homes, from 57 to 48. He then directed attention to Sundance's responses to staff's February 11, 2021, review of the proposal, as follows:

1. Application Materials:

a. Detailed Phasing Plan: Provide detailed information on project phasing.

*We have provided a Phasing Exhibit. We anticipate an 18-month phasing plan. Three buildings will be built every six months over the 18-month period.

b. School District Boundary: Illustrate exact location of the existing boundary line between School Districts 200 and 203.

*An exhibit has been provided illustrating the school district boundary in the vicinity of the property.

c. HOA Covenants: Provide preliminary set of Covenants for the HOA that will be set up to maintain the various common site improvements proposed in this project.

*A HOA Covenants Draft has been provided.

d. Economic Impact Study: Provide an Economic Impact Study that estimates the future market/assessed value and property tax generation for the residential subdivision project, the number of projected residents and the projected State per capita revenue Warrenville will receive as a result of these residents, and a breakdown of the number of projected school age children that would be generated by the proposed units. Please document expected sales price for the proposed townhomes.

*An Economic Impact Study/Fiscal Impact Analysis has been provided.

Mr. Laube presented the highlights of the study, which looked at the two major taxing districts (CUSD 203 and City of Warrenville). ISCS multipliers were used to estimate that a little over 17 school-aged children would be generated from this project, at a cost of \$15,298 per student. When this amount is compared to the reasonable and conservative property tax generation for

School District 203, it creates a surplus. The EAV generated by this project more than makes up for the incremental costs. Thus, the tax rate could be lowered over the entire District. The City's property taxes can be calculated in the same way. It will provide a net benefit of \$550,000 over the 20-year period. Since it is an infill site, the EAV generated by this project more than makes up for the incremental costs to the City, as well. It will not require additional staff; sewer and water impact fees will take care of costs.

e. Office Building Layout: Provide a detailed description and proposed floor plans that together clearly explain and illustrate how the existing office building will be reconfigured and used/operated in order to accommodate the proposed shared work environment.

*The current office building layout lends itself perfectly to a co-working layout with a good mix of private office space and open work areas and meeting spaces with the reconfiguration of furniture and space planning with desks and work areas. The current building requires very minimal layout changes.

Please see the Co-Optim Warrenville Floor Plans.

f. Townhomes Floor Plans: Provide townhomes floor plans with dimensions and an accurate scale. Include internal garage wall to wall and garage door opening and outside building measurements.

*The floor plans provided include measurements, however they are still considered conceptual and preliminary. The full architectural construction drawings will be completed and submitted for review and building permit.

g. Signage: Please provide information on any planned new ground/monument signs proposed for the site or planned for the office building so that City staff can determine if any special zoning approvals would be required from the City in order for that signage to be installed.

*A monument sign exhibit has been provided.

Please see the Monument Sign Exhibit.

2. Traffic Circulation and Access:

a. Circulation: Provide vehicle travel path exhibits to demonstrate that fire trucks can satisfactorily circulate through the proposed townhome development. Use AutoTuner similar software for the analyses.

*An exhibit showing the fire truck routing through the site has been provided.

Please see the Fire Truck Routing Exhibit.

b. Cross-access Connections: Provide a narrative regarding the intended use of the existing (but currently closed) cross-access connections to the Cornerstone development. Opening of the two cross-access connections allows more vehicles to exit to westbound Ferry Road via the signalized Torch Parkway intersection

*Access will remain open as cross-access connections. These accesses are temporarily chained to deter unauthorized access and loitering cars in the empty parking lot. All traffic has been addressed in our consultant's analysis.

c. Trash pickup: Explain where residential trash bins will be stored and set out for refuse pickup. If placed in the alleys by the garages, illustrate how garbage pickup trucks be able to traverse the alleys.

*Residential trash bins will be set at the end of the driveways for pickup. The new site plan allows for garbage truck access and turnaround. An exhibit has been provided illustrating the storage location of trash bins and garbage truck routing through the site.

Please see the Garbage Truck Routing Exhibit.

3. Parking:

a. Parking Analysis: Provide detailed parking analysis illustrating how the proposed on-site parking would be utilized to satisfy parking needs of the proposed office and residential components. Individual parking generation should be estimated for the proposed new townhomes and for the existing office. The proposed parking does not meet the DCR required number of spaces when computed separately for each use. A shared parking analysis should be provided, and any variations from the DCR should be justified. Note that the DCR shared parking methodology does not account for shared parking between residential and office land uses. The DCR methodology for shared parking generally assumes that all required office parking spaces will be occupied during the period from 7:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. on weekends.

*A Site Circulation and Parking Analysis has been provided.

Please see the Site Circulation and Parking Analysis Conclusion.

Mr. May expounded upon the parking study, stating that the existing traffic signal on Ferry Road provides exclusive right and left turn lanes for entering vehicles, and two outbound lanes, along with two cross-access easement connections. The site provides good synergy between office and resident traffic. Overall, he summarized the existing office building and proposed townhome development provide great synergy from a traffic standpoint. During the weekday morning peak hour when the majority of office generated traffic is arriving, the majority of residential generated traffic will be departing the site. Similarly, during the weekday evening peak hour when the majority of office generated traffic is departing, the majority of residential traffic is arriving on site.

Mr. May concluded the following:

- The proposed residential development will be a low traffic generator and will not significantly increase traffic on the adjacent roadway system.
- Given the estimated low traffic to be generated by the proposed residential development, the existing access system consisting of a signalized access roadway with Ferry Road and two cross access connections to the office development to the east will be adequate in accommodating future traffic volumes.
- The proposed parking supply of 141 residential parking spaces and 412 office parking spaces will be adequate in accommodating the parking demand of the development based on information published in the ITE Parking Generation Manual, 5th Edition.
- Should additional parking for the proposed townhomes be required, this demand can be accommodated by the surface parking lot when the office building is not being utilized in the evenings and on weekends.

City Traffic Consulting Engineer Adomshick of James J. Benes concurred with the findings of KLOA's study, in general. Cantera's specific shared parking methodology was developed 30

years ago, and has not changed. Current standards are more realistic, based on recent data collection and time of day for land uses. The proposed parking appears to be sufficient for the proposed land uses.

Mr. Adomshick stated the north cross-access easement between the subject development and Cornerstone office complex to the east was closed by the owner of this development as a precaution to keep people from loitering and unlawfully using the parking lot. Retention of this closure would not be problematic, in his view. He would like to hear from the Fire Protection District regarding its opinion on this matter.

Mr. Adomshick stated the southeasterly cross-access easement would allow Cornerstone the ability to cross through the subject parcel and take advantage of the traffic signal at Ferry Road—which was the original reason for providing it. He would recommend the Fire Protection District be consulted on its opinion of this connection.

Regarding a current traffic count, Mr. Adomshick stated a study was performed at the inception of Cantera, the original plan of which included heavier counts for a 350-room hotel, whereas this proposal has a lower traffic characteristic with its complimentary uses. He did not feel it was necessary to perform new traffic counts at this time—especially since the pandemic does not reflect previous counts. Many people are working from home, resulting in less travel. A study performed today would not be representative of future traffic. Traffic would be representative of a traditional office building; residential traffic would not have an impact on the operation of the traffic signal.

b. Parking Sharing: Provide a preliminary parking sharing and maintenance agreement that addresses the use and maintenance of parking and related drive aisles by the office tenants and homeowners.

*This has been addressed in our HOA Covenants Draft.

c. Parking Sharing Exhibit: Provide an exhibit illustrating proposed shared parking spaces.

*A Parking Sharing Exhibit has been illustrated on C3.1 of the engineering plans. See below.

d. Parking Calculations: The required parking for the office building should be based on the actual net floor area of the office building as defined in the Warrenville Zoning Ordinance, not the building's leasable floor area. Please update parking calculations in all application materials with your next submittal to reflect this change.

*Parking calculations have been addressed in our plans and the Site Circulation and Parking Evaluation.

4. Landscaping:

a. The Final Landscape Plan for the Subject Property approved as part of the existing PUD is attached. The property owner is obligated to maintain the landscaping on the Subject Property in accordance with the approved Final Landscape Plan unless an alternate plan is submitted and approved by the City. With your next submittal please provide landscape plan for the entire property, including both the office and residential components. The Landscape Plan should be prepared in accordance with the requirements of the Cantera DCR and Landscaping

and Screening Section of the Zoning Ordinance. Some of the existing plants are dead/dying, or overgrown and/or may no longer be appropriate for the space. Some plants have been recently removed. All plant materials that are removed and proposed for removal should be illustrated on the Landscape Demolition Plan.

b. The proposed building foundation landscaping for the townhomes is not consistent with the building elevation drawings that have been submitted to date: i.e., the proposed retaining walls illustrated on the elevation renderings would require a different building foundation landscape design than what is currently proposed. Please update and correlate these design documents with the next submittal.

c. Provide a more detailed landscape design along Ferry Road frontage of the property, including the office and residential fronts of the site. It is expected that the landscape design be prepared by a professional landscape architect, be coordinated with the landscape design existing along Ferry Road corridor in Cantera and consist of high quality plant materials.

*All items have been addressed in our landscaping plan, please see the Landscaping Plan.

5. Architecture:

a. Provide renderings of the rear and side building elevations.

*Renderings of the rear and side building elevations have been provided.

b. Provide an exhibit that illustrates height of a townhome building with a roof top terrace.

*A rendering has been provided illustrating the height of the townhome building with a rooftop terrace.

c. The proposed building elevations note that the roof top terraces would be offered as options, which means some buildings may not have roof terraces or have them on select units only. Provide building elevations that reflect how an individual townhouse with a mix of units, some with roof top terraces and some without, would look. Also clarify if those units without covered roof top terraces would still have an open roof top deck.

*All buildings have rooftop terraces.

d. Clarify where external HVAC equipment will be located on or near the townhouse buildings.

*HVAC equipment will either be located on the rooftop or side elevation adjacent to the building.

6. Architecture

a. Provide detailed information on the residential lifts referred to at the initial public hearing.

“Unlike traditional home elevators, Stiltz Home Elevators are freestanding and require no hydraulics or supporting walls. Our residential elevators are run from a dedicated 220 volt 15 amp wall outlet, or a dedicated 110 volt 15 amp wall outlet with a step-up transformer in the lift. Eliminating the need for a shaft, the home lifts travel ‘through the floor’ on self-supporting dual rails. Each Stiltz Home Elevator includes top-of-the-line safety features that allow the user to stay mobile, even during a power outage!

Our home lifts are safe, fast and quiet and can be fitted in almost any location in an American home.

Typically, it takes just 30 seconds to move between floors with a Stiltz Home Elevator. Our products are multi-functional, you can also use them for carrying heavy luggage and laundry. They can even accommodate the family pet!”

b. Provide examples of townhouse projects in the Chicago suburban area that have two-car garages and no driveway parking spaces.

The D.R. Horton website contains examples of a townhouse project located in Schaumburg that resulted from redevelopment of the Motorola site, and features two-car garages, with no driveway parking spaces.

c. Provide written responses to the staff and Plan Commission comments contained in the Courtesy Review Memo dated April 1, 2020.

1. Design and offer “live-work” floor plans that would cater to small professional home offices or design studios on the first floor and residential living quarters upstairs. This type of unit typically includes an inviting “store front” access and convenient visitor parking.

*Our row home concept offers ground floor home offices but we discourage the use as commercial storefront access which would be counterproductive to a peaceful and residential feel and may potentially disturb neighbors.

2. Incorporate carefully designed pocket park amenities within the project to provide places for residents to sit, relax, enjoy attractive landscaping, and interact with their neighbors.

*We have several areas within the development which address this comment.

3. Provide a contiguous system of pedestrian walkways that connect all of the units in the project and provide safe and convenient access to the nearby bicycle path.

*We have addressed this in our site plan.

4. Incorporate high-quality materials and design elements into the buildings. This includes items such as:

- *Providing a material amount of articulation in the façades and eave lines of the buildings along with incorporating interesting masonry/stone design elements at a level that would exceed that of a typical conventional development.*

- *Flat roofs with roof top decks and/or exterior balcony options that would differentiate this project from other existing and currently under construction attached single-family housing in the area.*

- *Constructing buildings that meet high energy efficiency standards and offering renewable energy options.*

*All of the above are incorporated in our plan.

5. Avoid a traditional suburban “greenfield” row home subdivision layout, or architectural designs, and price points that would directly compete with other townhome projects currently under construction in Warrenville at this time.

*We have addressed this in our design and price-point.

7. Engineering/SWM:

a. Provide a preliminary grading plan with foundation elevations of the main floor and garage, spot elevations to ensure max 3:1 slopes and spot elevations to show overland flow direction to ponds.

b. Update the sanitary sewer population equivalent calculations to 3.5 PE per unit and provide updated document with your next submittal.

*These have been addressed in our plans.

8. Staff Recommended Site Plan Revisions: Please note that City staff is reviewing the building, drive aisle, and parking layout illustrated on the initial PUD submittal that was distributed to the Plan Commission in advance of the February 4, 2021, meeting and intends to provide the applicant with an initial set of recommended site plan revisions before the end of the week of February 19th.

*We have provided updated site plans.

Responses to the following questions for the developer, posed in the February 11, 2021, staff review, were then covered:

1. What does the developer consider to be an urban environment? Besides dense housing how is this development urban? Where is the “third space” (i.e. not home, not work) that makes for an urban sensibility? It seems that such would be especially important for homes housing only one or two people.

*The design of the interior space layout and the close proximity to shopping, work and entertainment attribute to the urban environment for this development.

2. Will such upscale housing situated between an expressway, a busy city street and two parking lots be attractive to people at the proposed price-point and level of income?

*Please refer to our Feasibility Study/Analysis of Market Potentials prepared by Development Planning Partners for details.

3. Could the developer arrange a formal agreement on use of the parking space belonging to the business?

*Yes, this has been provided in our HOA Covenants.

4. Physical fitness will likely be a value to many of the potential owners. Will there be a gym in the shared workplace? If so, could it be available to the owners?

*Co-Optim has a small gym available for members. Lifetime Fitness is available for owners.

5. How could a sense of community, or at least support the possibility of socialization, be facilitated among the owners?

*We feel community is not only this project but created among the surrounding developments and Warrenville as a whole.

6. How could plantings enhance the overall design? If I remember correctly, they will provide us with a landscaping plan for our next meeting.

*The full landscaping plan has been completed.

7. If the target owner age is 25-45, surely there will be children. How can the outside area be made more child friendly?

*We can add a playground set to add to a more child-friendly environment.

8. I like the interior design and the rooftop space. But could you offer more support for why a potential owner would buy one of these units, in this location, with few urban amenities, at this price?

*Please refer to our Feasibility Study/Analysis of Market Potentials prepared by Development Planning Partners for details.

9. We appreciate that you proposed this project for Warrenville, and that you have challenged us to think about “urban design.” What attracted you to locate here? What could we as a City do that would encourage more “urban design” projects?

*The available land within Cantera is perfect for urban style development. The addition of high-quality residential will help support the abundance of existing office space, retail and restaurants. Creating a comprehensive live-work-play environment will help bring Cantera and the surrounding retail in Warrenville into the next generation of lifestyle by reimagining the synergy of workplace and community living.

Plan Commissioners provided the following comments:

- Com. Lockett requested confirmation of ownership. He asked the location of snow removal storage. He inquired whether the surfaces would be re-seal coated after completion of the project. Com. Lockett suggested an entrance to the office parking lot rather than having vehicles drive across the front of residences. He preferred eliminating the northeast connection to the property if the Fire Protection District concurs, and suggested elimination of both connections to eliminate all cut-thru traffic. Overall, he approves of the project because he prefers high-level row homes rather than empty parking lots.

Dir. Mentzer provided the reason for the cross-access easement, recalling that when Subarea E was subdivided 20 years ago, a cross-access easement was required by the City for traffic circulation and access to signals recorded to the benefit of every lot. It allowed internal travel to Winfield Road. It would require cooperation of all three properties, and the City traffic engineer would have to concur. It could be eliminated, or it could be closed to emergency access only.

Mr. Elias confirmed he was the owner of the property and that resurfacing of the parking lot would take place.

- Com. Miller expressed his appreciation for the effort to answer each question posed at the February 4, 2021 public hearing. He agreed to go along with the urban style of the project. He counted the total parking to be 133 spaces, and not 141 spaces, and asked staff to review these numbers. He expressed concern over the densely populated Co-Optim building, and inquired as to the maximum number of people it would house. He

inquired if the parking lot use was addressed in the covenants, and felt a formal agreement between the residents and Co-Optim should exist.

Mr. Elias replied that a large amount of desks were removed, and the building would not be run at high occupancy. The concept should be similarly compared to that of LifeTime Fitness' operation, which provides for ample occupancy, but is typically at 10-15% occupancy in the evenings. Parking was addressed in property owners' association documents; overflow will be permitted.

- Com. Pepple thanked the applicant for its extensive work, but expressed concern regarding the lack of parking in close proximity to townhomes, and the need for two parking spaces in front of garages. The City's Edgebrook subdivision exemplifies such deficiency. He proposed the scenario that would allow for two parking spaces in front of garages if the north cross-access easement was eliminated and the buildings were repositioned sideways. He inquired as to plans for the space that would become available if the north cross-access easement was to be eliminated.

Dir. Mentzer replied the Institute of Traffic Engineers studies this type of development for parking from a practical standpoint, and found that less than two spaces are required per dwelling unit. The City has over-parked some of its older residential developments in the past. A parking space costs in the range of \$5,000-\$10,000. The proposed parking is sufficient, efficient, and satisfies parking needs. Prospective tenants who are not comfortable with the parking arrangement would not purchase the property. The Edgebrook subdivision offers one-car garages and driveways, 36-foot wide streets, and is affordable to families.

Mr. Elias replied that aesthetics are extremely important in his developments. This proposal provides ample parking for residents and guests. He incorporated carriage-style garage doors to avoid having double garage doors left gaping open, as is often the case. In his experience, vehicles that are not even serviceable are left parked in such double parking areas outside garages. He strives to avoid an unsightly lineup of parked cars in front of his row home developments. The elimination of the north cross-access easement may provide an opportunity for green space or a park.

- Com. Tullier commented that personally, she would not find the proposed proximity to parking an impediment to visiting a resident of the development.

Audience comment was as follows:

- Mike Hoffman of Second Street commented that each time commercial property is used for residential development, future property taxes will not be lowered. The City spent \$77 million for Cantera to consist of commercial development. This proposal is counter-productive to that initiative, and not a wise use of land. The site could house a high rise in the future.
- George Wundsom of Amber Lane concurred with Com. Miller's comments regarding shared parking. As a ten-year resident, he has observed that in the past three to four years, multi-family developments have been built, of which he is not proud. He feels the Everton development is an eye sore. He is concerned this proposal will hurt the community. His hope is that the Plan Commission and City Council will ensure this is an

excellent luxury project. Many variations are requested, which he interprets as this project will ultimately have less greenery. Warrenville's remaining development should be done in excellent quality, which will attract the right type of people and businesses to town.

- Bob Siebert of Albright Court expressed concern over the owner's option to lease townhomes, and felt this would lead to maintenance issues and problems. The special warranty deed signed July 7, 2020, indicates the 19-acre property was sold for \$10 to a different group, and Mr. Siebert requested confirmation as to the identity of the owner. He also requested clarification of the landscape company Mr. Elias owns, and whether Vintage builds single-family homes, as depicted on its website.

Mr. Elias replied he is the owner of both Vintage Luxury Homes and Axio Ventures LLC. He confirmed he has also built row home developments. He established Everything under the Sun Landscaping in 1989.

Mr. Siebert then provided a history of Cantera's creation. In the 1970s, 1,100 single-family homes were built in Warrenville, in developments like Winchester and Thornwilde. By 1980, the City knew it had financial problems in tax revenue, and decided to help its citizens by the creation of Cantera. In 1986, City Council passed TIF District #1. He quoted former Plan Commission Chair John Davis as saying the only form of development that benefits Warrenville and gives more than it takes is business, offices, commercial, and industrial. Cantera's sole purpose was to create a 660-acre development to benefit taxpayers. \$77 million of taxpayer money was paid to LaSalle Partners and Amoco for this development. Cantera's original townhomes fit Cantera's guidelines. In Cantera, the City sought something substantial it could utilize for the next 50 years for long-term marketing and investment. Spot zoning was not part of it. Cantera is 25 years old; various corporations have come and gone, to be replaced by others—all due to Cantera's location and the DCRs. Bosch was recently interested in this site. Just because the site is currently empty does not mean it will be vacant in two years. Naperville waited for 18 years to get a large hotel. In Mr. Siebert's opinion, if an applicant requests 19 variances to make its project work, it does not belong in Cantera. The area was not designed for residential development. It does not fit in the neighborhood; it is a high-density residential strip mall.

- Sheila Wakely of Amber Lane stated she is directly impacted by this proposal. All development from the last two years impacts the City. People moved to Warrenville because they did not want new development. The Commission and Council needs input from citizens for zoning changes. With the onset of COVID and lack of a local newspaper, there is less ability to be informed of new developments. After having called six times, she has received no return calls. This process needs to be slowed down, as certain things were not addressed. In the last two days, she has spoken to 42 people. The common sentiment from 12 people in a row was, "The City does not listen." Some people do not think they have a chance to speak up—and that is terrible! People want a say; they do not mind losing a battle—but want to be heard.

Ch. Cosgrove read a letter into the record from the Forest Preserve District of DuPage County, which identified the inclusion of two invasive species, namely *Alnus glutinosa* (Black Alder) and

Pyrus calleryana ‘Chanitcleer’ (Chanticleer Pear). The District requested these two species be removed from the landscape plan and substituted with non-invasive species, such as River Birch, Redbud, Ironwood or Serviceberry.

COM. PEPPLE MOVED, SECONDED BY COM. TULLIER, TO CONTINUE THE PUBLIC HEARING UNTIL APRIL 8, 2021.

ROLL CALL VOTE:

Ch. Cosgrove stated the soil conditions on site may require extra foundation work if the townhomes go forward. Mr. Elias acknowledged the statement.

Aye: Cosgrove, Pepple, Lockett, Miller, Tullier, Burns

Nay: None

Absent/Excused: Chapman, Davis, Leonard

D. CITIZENS’ COMMENTS

None.

E. COURTESY REVIEW

1. 2S161 Route 59 / David Martinelli

Located on the east side of Route 59, north of Ridge Drive, south of Mack Road
Potential request for variance from Zoning Ordinance #1018 to allow for reduced interior side yard setback, in order to construct addition to existing detached garage.

David Martinelli addressed the Commission and directed attention to a presentation regarding his request to build an addition onto his existing detached garage that would double it in size from 950 square feet to 1,900 square feet. The existing structure is located three feet away from his property line, and he would like an expanded place to tinker on cars from home, and provide a parking space for his children.

Pl. Domovessova requested clarification of a patio area to the south of the structure, and whether it needed to be as wide as reflected, because accessory structures are not permitted to encroach on the side yard setback. Mr. Martinelli replied the area is merely a slab for messy projects. A small backup generator will also be placed in such location. Pl. Domovessova replied that emergency backup generators must be located no less than 12.5 feet from the property line.

Ch. Cosgrove commented he was in agreement with the staff memo, and that the original garage was built under different zoning regulations. The case seems reasonable and the addition makes sense, but he had an issue with the concrete pad, because leaf blowers can be utilized to clean indoor debris, and dust collectors catch table saw shavings. He asked the applicant to resubmit the drawings, with dimensions.

Mr. Martinelli stated the existing pergola mimics the architecture of the house and is not habitable, as it has no water connection and is not air conditioned. Ch. Cosgrove replied it may

serve as an office, but it becomes a policing issue for Code Enforcement if a renter is brought in. Mr. Martinelli stated he had no intention of renting the space.

Com. Burns inquired whether the concrete pad could be done in permeable pavers; Pl. Domovessova replied the same setback requirement would apply.

Com. Lockett proposed the use of gravel. He also suggested making the structure smaller.

Com. Miller suggested it would be helpful if a plat were provided to show the house with the old and proposed new garages. He requested clarification on the garage doors. Mr. Martinelli replied the existing structure has three bay doors that face north and the house is to the east; on the new structure, the door faces toward the house.

Com. Pepple stated he is in agreement with the slab being located five feet out, since the backup generator would serve the house only. He would not encourage a generator against the south face of the garage for the neighbor's sake. He encouraged five feet of concrete outside of the service door, and that the new service door on the existing garage be placed on the northwest corner of the existing garage, for flow.

Ch. Cosgrove summarized the Commission's general support for the proposal; however, establishing hardship for the concrete pad has garnered mixed reviews. He cautioned that if the applicant proceeds to move forward, he should follow the staff memo guidelines.

Mr. Martinelli thanked the Commission and announced he would likely minimize the concrete and proceed with an application for variance request.

F. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

1. Regular Meeting of February 4, 2021

CH. COSGROVE MOVED, SECONDED BY COM. PEPPE, TO APPROVE THE FEBRUARY 4, 2021, MINUTES, WITH THE FOLLOWING CHANGES:

- Page 3, Paragraph 8, Line 1 – Insert “(Leonard was having a connection problem)” after Roll Call Vote.
- Page 6 Paragraph 3, last sentence – Delete entire sentence.

ROLL CALL VOTE:

Aye: Cosgrove, Pepple, Lockett, Miller, Tullier, Burns

Nay: None

Absent/Excused: Chapman, Davis, Leonard

MOTION ADOPTED UNANIMOUSLY.

G. CITIZENS' COMMENTS

There were no comments or emails from the public.

H. CHAIRMAN'S REPORT

Ch. Cosgrove reported he spoke on the phone to a salesperson for the D.R. Horton project, which has various parking layouts, including a layout similar to the proposed Sundance row home project. The sales person reported they have not experienced any discernable difference in sales success from one product to another, and that they park in parallel, on small pads in front of garages. He also found various co-work suburban office projects to visit.

I. COMMUNITY AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Com. Miller inquired whether a limit can be imposed on individual public comment. Ch. Cosgrove replied no limit can be imposed in a public hearing. Dir. Mentzer responded unless comment is not germane to the issue, or repetitive, the City tries to give people discretion on offering opinions and comments.

J. SR. PLANNER'S REPORT

No report.

K. ADJOURN

COM. PEPPLE MOVED, SECONDED BY COM. LOCKETT, TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 10:09 P.M.

ROLL CALL VOTE:

Aye: Cosgrove, Pepple, Lockett, Miller, Tullier, Burns

Nay: None

Absent/Excused: Chapman, Davis, Leonard

MOTION ADOPTED UNANIMOUSLY.

Marie Lupo, Recording Secretary