

# VILLAGE OF HOMEWOOD



## MEETING MINUTES

DATE OF MEETING:

April 23, 2026

## PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION

7:00 pm

Village Hall Board Room  
2020 Chestnut Street  
Homewood, IL 60430

### CALL TO ORDER:

Chair Pro Tem Bransky called the meeting to order at 7:01 pm.

### ROLL CALL:

Roll call was performed by Chair Pro Tem Bransky. Present from the Village were Director Angela Mesaros, Director of Economic & Community Development serving as Staff Liaison; Noah Schumerth Assistant Director of Economic & Community Development, and Darlene Leonard, Building Department Secretary. There were 2 members of the public in attendance, and there were no members of the public on Zoom webinar.

AYES: 6 (Members Alfonso, Cap, O'Brien, Johnson, Castaneda, and Chair Pro Tem Bransky)  
NAYES (ABSENT): 1 (Chair Sierzega)

### APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES:

Chair Pro Tem Bransky asked for any changes to the minutes from the April 9, 2026 meeting.

Member O'Brien stated on page 2 Assistant Director Schumerth's name was omitted from the roll call and that it should be added. The comment attributed to Member Bransky was asked by him and should be changed to Member O'Brien. And on Page 8 in the second sentence of Member Bransky's comments wide should be changed to wise.

Chair Pro Tem Bransky stated on page 7, in Assistant Director Schumerth's response, wants should be changed to want.

A motion to approve the minutes as amended by Member O'Brien; seconded by Member Alfonso.

AYES: 2 (Members Alfonso and O'Brien)  
NAYES: 0 (None)  
ABSTENTIONS: 4 (Members Cap, Johnson, Castaneda, and Chair Pro Tem Bransky)  
ABSENT: 1 (Chair Sierzega)

Assistant Director Schumerth stated the minutes were not approved and will be brought back up at the next meeting.

### PUBLIC COMMENT:

Chair Pro Tem Bransky asked if there were any public comments not related to the items on the agenda.

Meeting Minutes | April 23, 2026

- **There were no public comments.**

## REGULAR BUSINESS:

Assistant Director Schumerth stated that the applicant for Case 26-25 was not in attendance and to move ahead to the next case.

### **Cases 25-13, 25-15, and 25-16 Rezoning, Special Use Permit, and Site Plan Review for Metra/ComEd Traction Power Substation and Transformation Facility at 18277 Park Avenue:**

Chair Pro Tem Bransky stated his employer WSP works for Metra and is part of the Metra PMO. He did ask Metra if his company would be involved and it is not. The company is involved in the Van Drunen/Millennium project. The PMO said there is no issue and his boss has no issue with him hearing about the case. Chair Pro Tem Bransky stated that if there is an issue he would recuse himself.

Member Cap asked if it was appropriate to oversee the case.

Chair Pro Tem Bransky stated that is why he made the statement; there is no direct involvement.

- **Staff Liaison Mesaros stated there is no direct benefit so there is no conflict.**
- **Assistant Director Schumerth stated it was reviewed earlier in the day with Member Bransky and that there are no ethical concerns.**

Chair Pro Tem Bransky introduced the case and swore in Kevin Korab from Chicago, and stated there is a lot contingent on future actions and documentation and asked if any comments had been received.

- **Assistant Director Schumerth stated nothing was received.**

Mr. Korab stated he is a consultant of Hatch Consultants for Metra. They need to expand their electrical needs and a ComEd transformer is involved also. The request to have change the land to PL-2 from B-2. It's less than 2,000 square feet with a fenced area on the north end and the existing CN tower to the south. It would be a private building for Metra Personnel only. It would not be occupied and be for electrical equipment only. An additional ComEd transformer would be installed and there would be landscaping added. As for the lighting photometrics, there would be task lighting at the entrance and exit of the building and it would be less than 1 footcandle at the property line.

Member Castaneda stated it makes sense to have the location be zoned PL-2.

Member Johnson stated he had no questions and that the plan states that the project will take 5 parking spaces and asked what impact it would have on parking for the Village.

- **Assistant Director Schumerth stated it is something to look at with the purchase and sale agreements for compensation for them. The lot isn't usually 100% full, but the Village would have to watch the demand of the lot over time. Schumerth stated that the parking acquisition shouldn't have an immediate impact on commuter parking.**

Member Johnson asked how far out the fence would be.

- **Mr. Korab stated it would be less than 50 feet, but was unsure of the exact distance and would revisit the topic and find the exact number.**

Member O'Brien asked when the estimated construction start date will be, and the expected project length.

- **Mr. Korab stated it would start by September 2026 and be done by early 2028 including close out. The site activity would be less than 1 year, but would have to check the construction schedule.**

Member O'Brien asked how it would affect parking access, the street, and if it would be shut down.

- **Mr. Korab stated Metra doesn't work on properties during peak commuter hours. Korab reiterated that Metra could work with the Village on scheduling if there is a concern.**

Member O'Brien asked if there would be a bottleneck on Park Avenue.

- **Mr. Korab stated yes.**

Member O'Brien asked when expected construction work would begin on the north viaduct.

- **Staff Liaison Mesaros stated the last date the Village was given was March. They are working on permission from Metra and CN.**
- **Assistant Director Schumerth stated they have not given a final schedule.**

Member O'Brien asked if the two projects happening at the same time will cause problems.

- **Staff Liaison Mesaros stated it's unknown.**
- **Member O'Brien asked if the viaduct would be shut down for the construction and stated that Metra should look into the project and inform the public what their options will be.**
- **Assistant Director Schumerth stated the Village will also inform the public. They don't want to encourage people to turn around at Berkot's and want to find proper detours for residents. Detours will be posted and will tell Metra for the alternative routes.**

Chair Pro Tem Bransky asked, for clarity, what if any streets would be closed.

- **Mr. Korab stated he does not know of any planned street closures with construction.**

Member O'Brien asked when the negotiations are expected to be done.

- **Assistant Director Schumerth stated June 2026. It was a reasonable date given by the applicant to have the application in for a lot line adjustment or resubdivision.**

Member O'Brien asked if there could be any delays with the project start.

- **Assistant Director Schumerth stated yes, and it may need to be extended, but it's wanted sooner rather than later to get moving forward.**

Member Cap asked the reason for the proposed project.

- **Mr. Korab stated that it is designed to support electrical needs to continue service on the line.**

Member Cap asked if there is a deficiency in supply now and if the building would be for storing or housing transformers.

- **Mr. Korab stated he is not sure about the supply and it would be for housing active transformers.**

Member Cap asked if the electric supply would be coming from the new ComEd transformer installed to the south and the status of the other one on Park Avenue.

- **Mr. Korab stated it would and there are no plans to demolish the other transformer as far as he is aware; it is not part of the scope for the project.**

Member Cap asked if power would be added to the area and improve the situation with ComEd service in the area, and if Metra owns property between the lot and the railroad.

- **Mr. Korab stated the power is for Metra's needs and doesn't know other than that, but he could find out if it would affect the area. Korab stated that Metra does own all of the property including the rails.**
- **Assistant Director Schumerth stated there is a lot of right-of-way not included on the maps.**

Member Alfonso asked what prompted the project.

- **Mr. Korab stated he is not sure.**
- **Assistant Director Schumerth stated, from the site plan meeting, that goal is to improve reliability and increase capacity and the potential to run more trains.**

Member Alfonso asked if Homewood is a central location for the project.

Chair Pro Tem Bransky stated in his experience with these kinds of structures, there are more trains and longer trains with more power. More trains or longer trains in the corridor need more power and there will probably be more substations on the line. Bransky noted that CTA has substations every track mile. Bransky stated that there would likely be 2-3 man crews doing routine maintenance, and that it is not typically done daily. Bransky stated that a Metra truck might be seen there 1-2 times a week on average at this type of facility. Bransky stated that there is special attire and specific training needed to do work inside, and that there are no pollutants, no noise, and no vibrations produced by the facility. It's just electricity.

Member Cap asked what the ComEd supply would be.

- **Mr. Korab stated he was not sure of the numbers.**
- **Assistant Director Schumerth stated the Village Engineer has been working with Metra and ComEd since August 2025 to get to this point; concerns were addressed by the Engineer and others in Public Works.**

Member Alfonso stated it is a nice building; it doesn't look industrial.

Chair Pro Tem Bransky stated the schedule says approximately 2 years from now to close out.

- **Mr. Korab stated yes, and he can double check the schedule.**

Chair Pro Tem Bransky stated in his experience the bulk of the time is waiting for the equipment. Bransky stated that there could be an interruption on Park Avenue depending on where ComEd would tie into their lines and parking for the equipment staging.

- **Assistant Director Schumerth stated the water and sewer line may also cause planned disruptions because they come up from the lot rather than into the street.**

Chair Pro Tem Bransky asked Staff if it would come back if something changes.

- **Staff Liaison Mesaros stated if changes were made to the plans, it would be looked at again.**
- **Assistant Director Schumerth stated the only remaining application expected to be reviewed by the Commission would be the lot line adjustment from the resubdivision process. Schumerth stated that staff plans that June would be the last time it would be seen by the Commission, and that the Appearance Review will go to the Appearance Commission in May.**

Chair Pro Tem Bransky asked if it is acceptable to just read into the record the paragraph and note the number of conditions.

- **Staff Liaison Mesaros stated it is acceptable.**

Member Johnson asked about the green area indicated on the plat and if there can be comments on the area.

- **Assistant Director Schumerth stated it is all part of the site plan and that this meeting is the time to mention comments. It will go to the Appearance Commission also.**

Member O'Brien asked about the case numbers on page 1, if they would be 25 or 26.

- **Staff Liaison Mesaros stated they should all be 26.**

Chair Pro Tem Bransky said the correction can be made with the motion and asked if they should vote 3 times.

- **Assistant Director Schumerth stated approvals have been done as single votes lately.**

Motion by Member Johnson to approve Case 25-13, a zoning map amendment to rezone a proposed parcel of approximately 5.34 acres from the B-2 Downtown Transition and PL-2 Public Land and Open Space zoning districts to the PL-2 Public Lands and Open Space zoning district, to the Village Board of Trustees, subject to the following conditions: 1. The applicant shall apply for a lot line adjustment with the Village of Homewood and receive approval of final plat from the Planning and Zoning Commission and Village Board, and have a revised plat recorded with the Cook County Clerk's Office, to incorporate a 3,055 square foot (0.07 acre) portion of the parcel with PIN #29-31-306-019 (owned by the Village of Homewood) into the parcel with PIN #29-31-306-024.

And recommend approval of Case 25-15, a special use permit to allow the operation of a utility use within the PL-2 Public Land and Open Space zoning district, to the Village Board of Trustees;

And approve Case 25-16, a site plan review of proposed improvements to support a traction power substation and outdoor transformer yard for use by Metra and Commonwealth Edison, as proposed in the documents submitted by Puppala Phandra of Hatch Consultants Ltd, Metra, and GFT Inc, subject to the 8 conditions; and incorporate the Findings of Fact into the record; seconded by Member O'Brien.

AYES: 6 (Members Alfonso, Cap, O'Brien, Johnson, and Castaneda)

NAYES: 0 (None)

ABSTENTIONS: 1 (Chair Pro Tem Bransky)

ABSENT: 1 (Chair Sierzega)

**Assistant Director Schumerth stated the applicant for 26-25 is not in attendance and will move onto Case 26-25 and see if they are there after it.**

#### **Case 25-45, Text Amendment for Off-Street Parking Requirements:**

Chair Pro Tem Bransky introduced the case and stated Staff will present the amendments and background.

Assistant Director Schumerth stated the text amendment is due to a State bill that was passed in October 2025. The State bill is for a preemption of parking requirements within 1/8 mile of a transit corridor or 1/2 mile of any transit hub and it applies to both home rule and non-home rule communities. Halsted counts as a transit corridor. On-site parking cannot be required. It effects all of B-1 & B-2 and part of B-4 and some residential properties. There will still be a parking maximum and it can be enforced. And still have the authority to regulate parking in limited instances. The Village can no longer enforce a developer to have public spaces and be free. But the Village can still require parking for dwelling units, i.e. 1 per dwelling unit, and bike parking can still be required.

The first amendment is to the B-1 and B-2 districts to exempt them from parking requirements, and to add a transit overlay zone to the parking code. The amendments also look at other areas of the code to make sure the code is clear and to fix errors. To clarify requirements for buildings existing before January 10, 2023 because of a lack of clarity, simplification, and fix errors in the code numbers. There were challenges in the past with enforcing the parking table, the uses in the commercial center will be

looked at, a definition for EV parking will be added, and “multi-tenant commercial center” will be removed from the code.

Schumerth introduced that a parking plan will be created that will merge parking policies and plans in the downtown area. Schumerth noted that there was an inventory of parking completed by staff, and that there is enough parking downtown in the public lots based on the initial analysis.

Member Alfonso stated she is happy to see these amendments. Alfonso stated that it will make life easier for business owners, and the amendment gives leeway to bring businesses into town.

Member Cap stated he did read the State statute and the comments on it. It is fairly specific saying “no parking requirements for anything” and it would allow prospective tenants to not comply with Village requirements and it has the potential to aggravate concerns about parking downtown. Member Cap asked, from a practical standpoint will this make things easier or harder.

- **Staff Liaison Mesaros stated it’s a broad question and it will be the case in every community, and it might change the nature of communities that are able to provide parking. Mesaros stated that the bill puts a lot of pressure on communities to provide public parking.**

Member Cap asked if parking garages would be prohibited by the proposed changes to the parking code text.

- **Staff Liaison Mesaros stated they’re allowed. Mesaros noted that by removing parking it can restrict what can go into some locations.**

Member Cap asked if public parking remains a permitted use, especially public garages.

- **Assistant Director Schumerth stated it’s not required to provide parking, but a parking structure can be built by the Village. It doesn’t prohibit the Village or a developer from building a parking structure. A lot of buildings have no parking or are deficient in parking and rely on the public lots. Many spaces available are empty in the evenings and not an efficient use of space which may be addressed by the changes to the code.**

Member Cap asked if private lots can be encouraged to provide public parking.

- **Staff Liaison Mesaros stated they have been doing that with other cases and the Village is looking into agreements for private lots and parking agreements for public parking.**

Member Cap asked how other communities view these State policy changes at the staff level.

- **Staff Liaison Mesaros stated La Grange had no parking requirements for parking in the downtown area, several communities have already done it.**
- **Assistant Director Schumerth stated Elmhurst is an extreme example with multiple parking structures for future development, and that is increasingly the planning trend for communities now.**

Member O’Brien asked on page 74 item 6 if it for commercial or residential being EV ready.

- **Assistant Director Schumerth stated either. EV ready is for larger multi-family or commercial.**

Member O'Brien stated the act doesn't preclude ADA.

- **Assistant Director Schumerth stated ADA is a federal requirement, but it would have to be looked into more to understand the relationship between federal requirements and the State bill.**

Member O'Brien stated there is no reference to ADA in the State statute.

- **Staff Liaison Mesaros stated ADA requirements are based on the number of required parking spaces.**
- **Assistant Director Schumerth stated that reasonable accommodation is required for projects in the Illinois Accessibility Code, and developments must be properly routed with reasonable access. Schumerth stated these requirements do not change.**

Member Castaneda stated on the Municipal League website it says business have continuing ADA requirements.

- **Assistant Director Schumerth stated more research would have to be done on the topic.**

Member O'Brien stated at first reading the entire statute seems problematic.

Member Johnson stated the trend seems to favor larger cities than smaller towns and depends on population surrounding the transit area. Member Johnson said he's unsure if it works in smaller communities.

Member Castaneda stated in a lot of ways it makes things simpler and we'll have to adjust to the mandate.

Chair Pro Tem Bransky asked how the amendment addresses concerns about individual situations, like parking at specific businesses.

- **Staff Liaison Mesaros stated the special use standards would give the ability to argue that parking is not sufficient to support a use without impacting other properties or other concerns, even when spaces are not required.**

Chair Pro Tem Bransky asked if there is the ability to shut something down in a special use situation.

Member Johnson stated "parking" cannot be used.

- **Staff Liaison Mesaros stated they would have to use the impact on the surrounding area rather than concerns about parking requirements.**

Chair Pro Tem Bransky asked if events and assembly uses can be limited in the downtown area.

- **Staff Liaison Mesaros stated they would have to look into it and other uses too, on a case by case basis reviewed by the Commission.**

Chair Pro Tem Bransky asked if the Village can require existing properties to provide public parking.

- **Staff Liaison Mesaros stated she does not believe they can.**

Chair Pro Tem Bransky asked if there were any public comments.

There were no public comments.

Motion by Member Castaneda to approve case 25-45, text amendment for Off-Street Parking Requirements, to the Village Board of Trustees, including amendments to a) Section 44-05-01, including Table 44-05-01 (c); b) Section 44-05-02 (j), Section 44-05-02 (k), and Section 44-05-02 (m); c) Table 44-03-04; and Section 44-09-02; and Incorporate the Findings of Fact into the record; Seconded by Member Alfonso.

AYES: 6 (Members Alfonso, Cap, O'Brien, Johnson, Castaneda, and Chair Pro Tem Bransky)

NAYES: 0 (none)

ABSTENTIONS: 0 (None)

ABSENT: 1 (Chair Sierzega)

#### **Case 26-25 Special Use Permit for Salon/Spa Establishment at 18019 Dixie Highway:**

Chair Pro Tem Bransky introduced the case and asked if any comments had been received.

- **Assistant Director Schumerth stated no.**

Chair Pro Tem Bransky swore in the applicant Karly Ivy.

- **Ms. Ivy stated the business would be for lashes, facials, nails with a specialty for those with diabetes, makeup, and brows. Ivy stated that the focus would not be on hair. Most would be by appointment and most customers are local. There is hope to bring in makeup artists and brow techs.**

Member Castaneda asked if walk-ins are allowed and what the hours would be.

- **Ms. Ivy stated walk-ins are welcome if someone is free. The hours are 9a-5p and until 8p with appointments only.**

Member Castaneda asked if there would only be 2 employees and how many customers would be in the business at the busiest time.

- **Ms. Ivy stated yes, just two for now and 1-2 customers, and the hours will be fairly limited.**

Member Castaneda asked if there would be any retail sales at the business.

- **Ms. Ivy stated yes. Currently there are face washes and they are looking into getting the necessary license to sell higher-end products.**

Member Johnson asked for clarification about the business operation hours on each day.

- **Ms. Ivy stated Monday-Wednesday currently are closed, but that may change with the location change. Tuesday is 9-5, Thursday & Friday are 9-8, and Saturday and Sunday depend on the demand.**

Member O’Brien asked if the 3 beauty booth workers would be employees or independent contractors.

- **Ms. Ivy stated they would be independent contractors with rules to follow.**

Member O’Brien stated in the Findings of Fact #6 should be changed from a fitness use to a salon/spa use.

Member Alfonso asked if the applicant had a location currently.

- **Ms. Ivy stated that they are operating in a leased space in Olympia Fields.**

Motion by Member Alfonso to approve Case 26-25, Special Use Permit for salon/spa establishment at 18019 Dixie Highway and Incorporate the Findings of Fact as amended into the record; Motion seconded by Member Cap.

AYES: 6 (Members Alfonso, Cap, Castaneda, Johnson, O’Brien, and Chair Pro Tem Bransky)

NAYES: 0 (None)

ABSTENTIONS: 0 (None)

ABSENT: 1 (Chair Sierzega)

**NEW BUSINESS:**

Staff Liaison Mesaros stated this would be her last meeting as she has accepted another position and would be leaving.

**OLD BUSINESS:**

Holladay Properties will be at the next meeting for discussion of the building at Ridge & Harwood.

**ADJOURN:**

Member Castaneda made a motion to adjourn; seconded by Member O'Brien. The meeting adjourned at 8:52 pm.

AYES: 6 (Members Alfonso, Cap, O'Brien, Johnson, Castaneda, and Chair Pro Tem Bransky)

NAYES: None

ABSTENTIONS: None

ABSENT: 1 (Chair Sierzega)

Respectfully submitted,

*Darlene Leonard*

**Darlene Leonard**  
**Building Department Secretary**