

Village of Lombard

Village Hall
255 East Wilson Ave.
Lombard, IL 60148
villageoflombard.org



Minutes

Monday, November 17, 2025

7:00 PM

Village Hall - Board Room

Plan Commission

Leigh Giuliano, Chairperson
Commissioners: Ruth Sweetser, Bill Johnston,
Alissa Verson, Robert Spreenberg,
Brendan Flanigan, Farrah Ali,
Bill Ware, and Michelle Johnson
Village Staff Liaison: Anna Papke

Call to Order

Chairperson Giuliano called the meeting to order at 7:00pm

Pledge of Allegiance

Chairperson Giuliano led the Pledge of Allegiance

Roll Call of Members

Present 8 - Ruth Sweetser, Leigh Giuliano, Bill Johnston, Robert Spreenber, Alissa Verson, Brendan Flanigan, Farrah Ali, and Michelle Johnson
Absent 1 - Bill Ware

Also present: Anna Papke, AICP Planning and Zoning Manager, and Jason Guisinger, Legal Counsel to the Plan Commission and Village

Chairperson Giuliano called the order of the agenda.

Ms. Papke read the Rules and Procedures as written by the Plan Commission.

Public Hearings

[250379](#)

PC 25-14: 2 Yorktown Center - Summit Townhome Development

Phase 2:

The petitioner, D. R. Horton, Inc. - Midwest, requests that the Village take the following actions on the subject property located within the B3PD Community Shopping District Planned Development (Yorktown Shopping Center and Yorktown Commons Planned Developments):

1. For the Yorktown Shopping Center Planned Development:

a. Pursuant to Section 155.504(A) (major changes in a planned development) of the Village Code, amend the Yorktown Shopping Center Planned Development, as established by Ordinance No. 1172 and subsequently amended, to change the geographical extent of the Yorktown Shopping Center Planned Development to remove the property at 2 Yorktown Center from the planned development;

2. For the Yorktown Commons Planned Development:

a. Pursuant to Section 155.504(A) (major changes in a planned development) of the Village Code, amend the Yorktown

Commons Planned Development, as established by Ordinance No. 7177 and subsequently amended, as follows:

- i. Change the geographical extent of the Yorktown Commons Planned Development to incorporate the property at 2 Yorktown Center into the planned development;ii. Amend the Yorktown Commons Planned Development Design Guidelines to incorporate the property at 2 Yorktown Center into the Design Guidelines as an extension of Yorktown Commons Parcel 4, with the requirements in the Design Guidelines applied to property at 2 Yorktown Center as a continuation of Parcel 4, except as provided for below;
3. For the property located at 2 Yorktown Center (former Carson's Furniture):
 - a. Pursuant to Section 155.504(A) (major changes in a planned development) of the Village Code, amend the Yorktown Commons Planned Development Design Guidelines, as stated in Section IV(E) and established by Ordinance No. 7177, as follows:
 - i. Amend the build-to lines for the proposed attached single-family (townhouse) residential development on the subject property to allow the exterior building elevation to be located more than 12 feet behind the south property line, where a 12-foot build-to line was established for townhouses;
 - ii. Approve a deviation from Section 153.244(B) of the Lombard Sign Ordinance to allow project identification signs with a height of five feet two inches (5'2"), where a maximum height of four feet is permitted;
 - b. Approve an attached single-family residential development based upon the submitted plans, pursuant to Ordinance 7177 and Section 155.511 of the Village Code (site plan approvals); and
 - c. Approve a final plat of subdivision. (DISTRICT #3)

Sworn in to present the petition was Anna Papke, Planning and Zoning Manager, and Chris Funkhouser of D. R. Horton, Inc., petitioner.

Chairperson Giuliano read the Plan Commission procedures and asked if anyone other than the petitioner intended to cross examine and, hearing none, she proceeded with the petition.

Mr. Funkhouser addressed the Plan Commission. D. R. Horton is the developer of the Summit at Yorktown townhome project at the corner of Grace Street and Yorktown ring road. Phase I of this development is currently under construction. The petitioner is under contract to purchase the property adjacent to Phase I in order to construct a second phase of townhomes. Mr. Funkhouser said that the petition included removal of the subject property from the Yorktown Shopping

Center Planned Development and incorporation of the subject property into the Yorktown Commons Planned Development. Mr. Funkhouser said the petitioner intended for Phase II to be a continuation of Phase I, with a seamless transition between the two phases. He noted that the project would be consistent with ongoing efforts to build more residential units near Yorktown Center.

The petitioner requested two changes to the Yorktown Commons Design Guidelines for the proposed development. The first was a change to the build-to line on the south side of the property. Phase I received a similar change, and the requested change for Phase II would allow for a consistent look across the development. The other change was to allow a taller project identification sign than otherwise permitted by the Design Guidelines. This would allow for the same style of signs previously approved for Phase I.

Mr. Funkhouser said the site is 3.6 acres. Phase II will include 59 townhome units, which will accompany the 90 townhome units in Phase I. There will be 0.27 acres of open space in the center of Phase II. Overall, there are 0.8 acres of open space (includes landscape areas throughout the development). Mr. Funkhouser noted there is also common open space in Phase I. The total open space provided across Phases I and II will exceed the amount of open space required for the property by the Yorktown Commons Design Guidelines.

Mr. Funkhouser said each townhome will have two garage spaces plus two spaces in the driveway. There are also guest parking spaces throughout the development. In total, there will be 4.2 parking spaces per unit, which exceeds the code requirement for two spaces per unit. He said the townhome product in Phase II will be the same as Phase I in terms of design.

Mr. Funkhouser acknowledged there are open comments from Public Works and the Fire Department that will be addressed during permitting. He described the lighting throughout the development, including lighting on the townhome units and lighting around the central green area.

Chairperson Giuliano asked if any person would like to cross examine. Hearing none, she asked if anyone would like to speak in favor or against this petition, or for public comment.

Marymae Meyer addressed the Plan Commission. Ms. Meyer was

concerned about recycling in multifamily developments. As a resident of Yorktown Green, she had found there was no recycling available in that development. She said it seems the individual developments need to manage recycling, and as a result many residents do not recycle. She said the problem intensified as more residential units were built. She suggested the Plan Commission or other committee with the Village could address these concerns.

Mr. Funkhouser said there would be a private contractor providing waste management and recycling within the Summit development.

Chan-Yu Wang addressed the Plan Commission. She is the HOA president of Club Croix, located on Oakton Drive, across Highland from Yorktown Center. She asked if a traffic study was done regarding increased traffic that might occur as a result of development around Yorktown. She was particularly concerned about the intersection at Highland Avenue and Majestic Drive and lack of turn signals for some traffic.

Mr. Funkhouser said that staff had KLOA prepare a traffic study, which had found there would be no negative impact on traffic as a result of the proposed development.

Chairperson Giuliano asked if any person would like to speak in favor or against this petition, or for public comment. Hearing none, she asked for the staff report.

Ms. Papke presented the interdepartmental review committee report, which was entered into the public record in its entirety. The petitioner is the developer of the Summit Townhomes, a 90-unit townhome development currently under construction at the northwest corner of Grace Street and the Yorktown ring road. The petitioner has acquired the adjacent property at 2 Yorktown for the purpose of constructing a second phase of the Summit townhomes. Phase II will consist of 59 additional townhome units and will be an extension of Phase I, with connected internal driveways and a continuation of the Phase I design scheme.

Phase I of the townhome development is in the Yorktown Commons Planned Development and is being built in conformance with the Yorktown Commons Design Guidelines. The subject property is currently in the adjacent Yorktown Shopping Center Planned Development. The petitioner is requesting that the subject property be

moved into the Yorktown Commons Planned Development so that the property can be developed as a continuation of the first phase, in compliance with the Yorktown Commons Design Guidelines. The expansion of Yorktown Commons to encompass the subject property will allow for continued development of medium- to high-density residential land uses along the perimeter of Yorktown Center. This action is consistent with the Village's long-term strategy of encouraging redevelopment that supports Yorktown Center while increasing housing choice and encouraging sustainable development patterns.

The petitioner is requesting two changes to the Yorktown Commons Design Guidelines to build the project as proposed. The first is an amendment to the required build-to line, which would allow the buildings to be set back farther from the Yorktown ring road than required by the Design Guidelines. The increased setback allows for adequate space for utilities and other infrastructure on the south side of the property. The Village approved a similar setback amendment for Phase I of the development. The second change is a deviation to allow for a project identification sign that is taller than would otherwise be permitted. This deviation was also approved for the Phase I signage and will allow the developer to construct consistent signage across both phases of the development. Staff supports both requested changes as they will allow for cohesive development across both phases of the project.

The Village's traffic consultant, KLOA, reviewed the proposed development in comparison to the previous development to assess impacts to traffic. KLOA found no negative impacts would accrue to Yorktown Center or the adjacent roadway network as a result of the 59 townhome units. With respect to parking, each townhome is required by code to provide two parking spaces. The proposed units will have two garage spaces plus room for two cars in the individual driveways. Additional guest parking spaces are provided throughout the development.

Ms. Papke noted that there are several outstanding comments from Public Works, Engineering, and the Fire Department noted in the staff report. The petitioner is aware of these comments and will address them as they work on final engineering and permitted.

Staff recommended approval of the petition subject to the conditions in the staff report.

Chairperson Giuliano asked if there were any questions or comments on the staff report. Hearing none, she opened the meeting to comments from the Commissioners.

Commissioner Johnston asked if there had been a lot of buyer interest in Phase I of the development.

Mr. Funkhouser said there was a lot of interest in the last 20 units remaining in Phase I.

On a motion by Commissioner Spreenberg, and a second by Commissioner Verson, the Plan Commission voted 8-0 to recommend that the Village Board approve the petition associated with PC 25-14 subject to the five (5) conditions in the staff report:

1. That the major changes to a planned development are valid only for the subject property within the Yorktown Commons Planned Development;
2. That the petitioner shall develop the site in accordance with the plans submitted as part of this petition and referenced in the Inter-Departmental Review Committee Report, except as they may be changed to conform to Village Code, or as provided as part of the original planned development approval set forth in Ordinance 7177;
3. That the petitioner shall apply for and receive building permits for the proposed development;
4. That the petitioner shall satisfactorily address all comments noted within the Inter-Departmental Review Committee Report; and
5. That this approval shall be subject to the commencement time provisions as set forth within Section 155.103(F)(11).

The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 8 - Ruth Sweetser, Leigh Giuliano, Bill Johnston, Robert Spreenberg, Alissa Verson, Brendan Flanigan, Farrah Ali, and Michelle Johnson

Absent: 1 - Bill Ware

Business Meeting

Approval of Minutes

On a motion by Commissioner Johnson, and a second by Commissioner Ali, the Plan Commission approved the Minutes from the October 20, 2025.

The motion was carried by the following vote:

Aye: 8 - Ruth Sweetser, Leigh Giuliano, Bill Johnston, Robert Spreenberg, Alissa Verson, Brendan Flanigan, Farrah Ali, and Michelle Johnson

Absent: 1 - Bill Ware

Public Participation

There was no Public Participation

DuPage County Hearings

There were no DuPage County Hearings

Chairperson's Report

There was no Chairperson's Report

Planner's Report

There was no Planner's Report

Unfinished Business

There was no Unfinished Business

New Business

There was no New Business

Subdivision Reports

There were no Subdivision Reports

Site Plan Approvals

There were no Site Plan Approvals

Workshops

Workshop on Former Northern Seminary Site – Comprehensive Plan and Development Considerations

Ms. Papke presented the workshop session. The subject property is the former Northern Seminary property at 600 E. Butterfield Road. The property is approximately 27 acres. A developer obtained zoning entitlements in 2020 to redevelop the property with a multi-phased development consisting of a Golf Social with Moretti's restaurant, a gas station and associated convenience retail, and a multifamily building with up to 400 apartment units. That developer began demolition of the former seminary buildings, and a portion of the property was transferred to the Village for construction of a water tower. However, none of the other planned redevelopment has occurred and the Golf Social developer has made the property available for sale.

D. R. Horton has expressed interest in the property for townhome development. They have provided a concept plan for a 159-unit development consisting of a mix of front- and rear-loaded units. Ms. Papke showed a concept site plan and townhome elevations provided by the developer.

Ms. Papke reviewed the existing Comp Plan and zoning designations on the property, which are Public Institutional and B3PD, respectively. The Comp Plan designation of Public Institutional is a holdover from when the property was the Northern Seminary campus. The B3PD zoning was granted with the 2020 zoning entitlements for the Golf Social concept. The property would need to be rezoned and the Comp Plan designation would need to be amended for the site to be developed with townhomes. The purpose of the workshop was to discuss whether the Plan Commission would be supportive of the plan and associated map amendments. Additionally, staff and the petitioner sought any comments the Plan Commission might have on the site plan.

To provide additional context for the discussion, Ms. Papke noted that there are a number of site characteristics that will impact the usability of the property for various types of development. These included limited frontage along Butterfield Road, the existence of the stormwater pond on the south side of the property, wetlands on the east portion of the property, and an existing private agreement to allow connection from the subject property to Convention Way, a private street owned by Target with a signalized intersection at 22nd Street.

Commissioner Verson said that previous discussions of this property and development around Yorktown had included questions about planning for bike and pedestrian facilities, walkways, parks, and other infrastructure to serve the new residential development in the area. She asked if there was an update on these discussions.

Ms. Papke said that the plan for the subject property includes sidewalks and pathways to serve the proposed townhomes. At a larger scale, the Village has been working with Yorktown to plan for sidewalks and other improvements along the Yorktown Ring Road with the intent of providing better connectivity between the residential developments, Yorktown Center, and the wider neighborhood.

Chair Giuliano said that this is a good issue to note, as the Yorktown area is not very walkable right now. She noted that the subject property

is very awkwardly shaped with a lot of wetlands and other features that limit how the site can be developed. She said the private road connecting to Convention Way to allow traffic to access 22nd Street is an important feature of the proposed development, because it will reduce reliance on Butterfield Road.

Commissioner Spreenbergs agreed that the connection to Convention Way/22nd Street is important. He asked what the private agreement to allow connection between the townhomes and Convention Way would involve. He also asked about the driveway connection shown between the subject property and the property to the east (Fountain Square).

Ms. Papke said that the connection to Fountain Square appears to have been in place since the 1960s, when the Seminary was developed. It was not clear whether there was a formal agreement governing that connection, but the Village would ask D. R. Horton to investigate that if the proposed development were to move forward. A private agreement to allow the connection to Convention Way would likely include an ingress/egress easement and provisions for maintenance of the roadway.

Commissioner Flanigan asked about the viability of the office buildings to the north and south of the subject property. He wondered if there was an opportunity to consolidate multiple properties in the area. Ms. Papke said that staff had not received any indication that the owners of those buildings were interested in selling or redeveloping, but staff is aware that the market for office properties is rapidly changing.

Commissioner Johnson asked how the proposed townhomes would impact availability of affordable housing in the Village. Ms. Papke said that the developer would set the sales price of the townhome units, and all indications are that this would be a market rate development. She said that the Village's existing housing stock is fairly diverse in terms of price point, with housing that is affordable to individuals at various income levels. More generally, the Village is part of a county-wide consortium that looks at affordable housing on the regional scale.

Commissioner Verson noted that there was a previous workshop on an affordable housing concept for a property on Grace Street at North Avenue. She asked about the status of that development. Ms. Papke said the developer had decided not to pursue the project due to site and financing constraints.

Commissioner Ali asked if the Village had data on the percentage of housing units that are single-family, townhomes, apartments, etc. She said that it seemed there had been a lot of apartments constructed recently and she wanted to understand more about the types of units in the Village. Ms. Papke said that much of the land in the Village is zoned for single-family residential units. While some of the higher profile projects in recent years had been for apartments or townhomes, staff also receives many permits for single-family homes and other housing types.

Commissioner Johnston said he wondered about determining the right balance between various housing types. He noted that the previously approved development would have brought desirable commercial development to the area. He asked if there had been an RFP or outreach to other developers to see if there was interest in the property for commercial development.

Ms. Papke said that since the Village does not own the property, it would not issue an RFP because the Village could not control who might purchase the property from the current owner. However, the Village does control the zoning entitlements that might be granted based on a specific proposal for development. Ms. Papke said that with respect to commercial development, staff and the Village are aware that the market for office and traditional commercial development has been shifting over the last 10 years. Properties that were previously assumed to be ideal for commercial development, including the subject property, may be due for a reconsideration of the types of land uses that would be viable and desirable in the long term. She noted that the approval of the Yorktown Commons residential development at Yorktown Center in 2015 was the beginning of an effort to reconsider the mix of land uses in the Yorktown area.

Commissioner Johnston said that the property was possibly ideal for residential development. He said there was a need for housing, and he agreed the subject property may not be ideal for commercial development due to limited visibility from Butterfield Road. However, he wondered if there was an ideal balance of residential versus commercial development that would serve the area well in the next 15-20 years.

Ms. Papke said that the right mix of land uses is a moving target, and that the Village is continually re-evaluating this question wholistically when it updates the Comprehensive Plan, and in more targeted ways

when it considers development of individual properties. She thought it was reasonable to re-evaluate this property for potential residential uses given the type of development that has occurred in the Yorktown area in the last 15 years.

Commissioner Verson asked for more information about the levels of affordable housing in the Village. Ms. Papke said that the state publishes data on the affordability of housing in communities based on housing prices and affordability of units relative to area median income. She said she could provide additional information to the Plan Commission on that data, but that Lombard has always been assessed by the state as having an adequate amount of housing affordable to people at various levels of income. She noted that a number of recent developments were geared toward lower income levels (400 E. St. Charles and 2001 S. Highland conversion from hotel to apartment units). She also said that the Village has a housing stock with units available at a variety of price points.

Commissioner Ali asked if the residential units being constructed around Yorktown are rental or owner occupied. Ms. Papke said that some of the townhomes are potentially available for rent, based on HOA rules that set a percentage limit on the number of units that could be rented. The apartments being constructed by Synergy at Yorktown Center (Yorktown Reserve) are all rentals.

Commissioner Sweetser noted that the Village is part of a region, and the Village should consider whether the development in the Village is responsive to the needs of people in the wider area. Ms. Papke agreed that land use decisions should be considered in the context of the wider region as well as the Village limits.

Commissioner Johnson asked how the schools in the area would respond to the proposed townhome development. Ms. Papke said that the school districts are generally concerned with development that will generate a large influx of students. Townhomes do not typically generate a high volume of students.

Commissioner Verson asked if there was a need for park space or a playground in the area. Ms. Papke said that green space has been a central concern for the Village as well as residents. Some of the new developments include privately-owned green space. Acquiring and building publicly owned green space would involve both the Village and the Park District. Conversations about whether there is an opportunity

for publicly owned green space in the Yorktown area are ongoing. This issue is on the radar for the Village Board as well as staff.

Commissioner Ali asked if the Village knows the percentage of owner-vs. renter-occupied housing units. Ms. Papke said she did not have the numbers in front of her but she could provide that information.

Commissioner Spreenbergsaid he liked that the concept plan showed the existing stormwater pond would remain. He asked if the stormwater pond would be sufficient for the proposed development. Ms. Papke said that the project engineers would need to calculate the net new impervious surface on the property to make sure the pond accounted for all the additional impervious surface.

Commissioner Spreenbergsaid that the property is an unusually shaped space that seems less than ideal for commercial land uses. He said residential uses seem reasonable. He similarly wondered if there could be more park activity in the area. He said the concept plan seems reasonable.

Commissioner Johnston agreed it would be nice to have additional park space given the influx of residential units in the area.

Commissioner Spreenbergsaid the walking path shown around the retention pond.

Chairperson Giuliano asked if there were no additional questions of comments, hearing none, she proceeded with the agenda.

Adjournment

A motion was made by Commissioner Johnson, and a second by Commissioner Spreenbergs, to adjourn the meeting at 8:16 p.m.

The motion passed by an unanimous vote.