

VILLAGE OF HOMEWOOD



MEETING MINUTES

DATE OF MEETING: **September 17, 2026**

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION

7:00 pm

Village Hall Board Room
2020 Chestnut Street
Homewood, IL 60430

CALL TO ORDER:

Chair Bransky called the meeting to order at 6:35 pm.

ROLL CALL:

Roll call was performed. Present from the Village were Noah Schumerth Director of Economic & Community Development and Darlene Leonard, Building Department Secretary. There were no members of the public in attendance, and there was 1 member of the public on Zoom webinar. Member O'Brien arrived at 6:36.

AYES: 5 (Members Alfonso, Sierzega, Cap, Castaneda, and Chair Bransky)

NAYES (ABSENT): 1 (Member Johnson)

APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES:

Chair Bransky asked for any changes to the minutes from the August 27 meeting.

Member Cap asked about software for the minutes.

Director Schumerth stated they have been using software to transcribe the minutes and he is still figuring out the best template to use with the Plaud.AI system.

Chair Bransky asked for a motion to approve the Minutes from August 27, 2026 meeting.

Motion to approve by Member Sierzega; seconded by Member Cap.

AYES: 5 (Members Alfonso, Sierzega, Cap, Castaneda, and Chair Bransky)

NAYS: 0 (None)

ABSTENTIONS: 1 (Member O'Brien)

ABSENT: 1 (Member Johnson)

PUBLIC COMMENT:

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

- **There were no public comments.**

REGULAR BUSINESS:

Meeting Minutes | September 17, 2026

C:\Users\MeetingsOfficeUser19\AppData\Local\Temp\tmpB2D5.tmp

Last Revised: 10/16/2026

Case 26-57: Site Plan Review to allow the development of a 45,110 square-foot light manufacturing facility at 1313-1351 175th Street, on 6.38 acres in the M-1 Limited Manufacturing zoning district:

Chair Bransky introduced the case and asked if the applicant needed to be sworn in again.

Director Schumerth stated no, Mr. LaRoy did not need to be sworn in again.

Director Schumerth stated to clarify for the Commission, this is a public meeting for a site plan review. The site plan is for specific aspects of the development. A few changes were made, but they are identified in the packet.

Member Sierzega stated on page 13 about the lighting. There appears to be a typo and asked if 6 or 7 light poles will be installed.

Director Schumerth stated 6.

Member Alfonso stated her packet didn't print properly so she does not have some of the drawings and asked why the equipment was moved to the east side of the factory facility.

Mr. LaRoy stated 2 years ago they did not have a detailed floor plan with the layout. The equipment will be on the east side of the building and that is where the loading dock is. The west side of the building is the lightest and easiest to move. Mr. LaRoy stated the east side is permanent with the meeting rooms and lunch room.

Member Alfonso asked if a decision had been made on the connector; if it would be one or two stories.

Mr. LaRoy stated the plan is still for two stories, but they are waiting on bids. The cost of steel went up 15% on Friday across the nation. They are trying to stay within budget.

Member Alfonso asked if the loading dock is in the front.

Mr. LaRoy stated yes, it is facing 175th Street.

Member Alfonso asked about the landscaping changes. It says minor changes and it's good that it's being reviewed by Staff.

Director Schumerth stated there were a lot of changes made in 2024 and this shows all the changes.

Mr. LaRoy stated the loading dock has always been in the front. That has not changed from 2024.

Member Cap asked how the driveways will relate to the across the street.

Director Schumerth stated there is largely not a lot of conflict and nothing was identified by the Village Engineer.

Member Cap stated there is no conflict for the existing driveway for the office building and stated it is the western driveway that is the question. There may be a potential conflict with a business across the street. There may be times when the egress out may interfere with traffic.

Director Schumerth stated it may still be single-family residences across from the western access.

Chair Bransky stated right now it's residential and that he looked at it as well. During the day there have been trucks in the center land waiting to get in. The building if far back enough from the street that if any trucks were waiting to exit onto the street they would be in the driveway, there may be a delay.

Member Cap stated the western entrance does align with the street in East Hazel Crest.

Member O'Brien stated the drawings look wonderful and he is glad the ingress and egress was changed from the 2024 submittal.

Member Castaneda stated to Staff on page 12 in the second paragraph, the color is gray, white, and red.

Director Schumerth stated it is gray and white.

Mr. LaRoy stated the existing building will be stained just the gray.

Member Castaneda asked how many employees will be onsite per shift.

Mr. LaRoy stated 50.

Chair Bransky asked for a motion to approve Case 26-57, Site Plan Review for Apparel Redefined at 1313-1351 175th Street, as proposed in the drawings submitted by Bruce F. Roth Architects and Metz and Company Landscape Architecture, and PG Enlightened, subject to the following conditions: 1. A revised landscape plan with the plant materials as proposed by the Village Arborist shall be submitted with building permit applications prior to the issuance of building permits. 2. An application for lot consolidation of the six (6) parcels included on the subject site shall be approved prior to the issuance of a certificate of occupancy for any building. 3. A plat of vacation for "Outlot A" as indicated on the attached plat of survey dated 10/07/2023, shall be approved by the Village Engineer, prior to the issuance of a certificate of occupancy for any building.

Member O'Brien made a motion to approve Case 26-57; and incorporate the Findings of Fact into the record; and second by Member Sierzega.

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

NAYES: 0 (None)

ABSTENTIONS: 0 (None)

ABSENT: 1 (Member Johnson)

Case 26-56: Planned Development Approval to allow the Development of a light manufacturing facility at 1313-1351 175th Street with approved modifications in the M-1 Limited Manufacturing zoning district:

Chair Bransky introduced the case.

Director Schumerth stated the proposed text amendment is for accessory uses in non-commercial places of assembly. There has been an uptick in requests to open smaller businesses in non-commercial

places of assembly such as clubs, lodges, and places of worship. The applicants are looking to open spaces without closing the original use. The Code has an issue. They are only allowed in residential districts R1-R4. The amendment would create a new use category "accessory office/personal service" category as a special use. It would limit the size to 25% of the floor area of the principal use, it limits the signage, and limits the location to be fully inside. And it would be a recommendation of the Planning & Zoning Commission to the Village Board.

Member Castaneda asked what about 25% makes it the sweet spot.

Director Schumerth stated it is the threshold elsewhere in the code. It maintains consistency. After that it becomes a more prominent use in the facility.

Member Castaneda asked if there would be inspections or review of the special uses.

Director Schumerth stated inspections are done by the Fire Department, and the process can be streamlined.

Member O'Brien asked how many are in non-residential zones.

Director Schumerth stated 3. They are all on Dixie Highway; 2 are in B-2 and 1 is in B-1.

Member O'Brien asked how they are enforced in non-residential.

Director Schumerth stated they are all legal non-conforming. They existed before the current code was written.

Member O'Brien stated at the top of page 31, the sentence stops.

Director Schumerth stated it should state "the accessory use has to close". The accessory use cannot operate on its own if the principal use closes.

Member O'Brien stated he wants to go back to the exceptions, and asked how this would impact commercial properties because the language isn't there.

Director Schumerth stated it can be addressed. It can be expanded to allow it as a special use in commercial districts.

Member O'Brien asked, about inspections, how the Village is approaching the existing property requirements, what the process is to allow it. If there is some sort of requirement or change to offset the inspections.

Director Schumerth stated they are continuing to evolve the special use process and are creating electronic reviews. The Building Department looks at it for use and if it's habitable. The processing is being developed now.

Member O'Brien asked what would happen if the property owner doesn't have the resources needed for the property maintenance.

Director Schumerth stated it is currently done with the business application process review. Currently, any issues need to be resolved before anyone can operate there. It is a challenge now and will continue to be a larger challenge.

Member O'Brien stated there is an organization that could assist and be given to the applicants, and asked if Staff is aware of it. Member O'Brien stated it is called Partners of Sacred Spaces out of Philadelphia. They work specifically with Churches.

Director Schumerth stated he is unaware of them would like to get their contact information.

Member O'Brien asked, for clarification, if the accessory use cannot operate if the principal use cannot, then it's a moot point.

Director Schumerth stated there are businesses now that can operate unless it's a life safety issue.

Chair Bransky stated it could create problems for existing buildings.

Building Department Secretary Leonard stated currently the Fire Department knows about commercial buildings better. The Building Department is aware of existing violations on the exterior of a building, but the Fire Chief has said no new businesses can open until the violations are corrected.

Member Cap asked if the amendment applies to places of assembly in residential areas only.

Director Schumerth stated it can be adjusted to include the legal non-conforming ones, but the amendment would have to be reworded.

Member Cap asked how it would affect the existing ones.

Director Schumerth stated they are allowed to operate. The commercial zoning districts were left out intentionally. By creating the amendments only allowing them in the residential districts it is very transparent.

Member Cap stated it could be approached by the ones in the commercial districts, and asked what would prohibit them from approaching the Village and transforming underutilized space.

Director Schumerth stated that right now they couldn't.

Member Cap stated it raises other questions.

Director Schumerth stated that it would be treated per property if it is something they want to explore. It would have to be revisited and adjust the language. It is written very conservatively because of the uses that have come in. They didn't include commercial because the existing uses are legal non-conforming and have to be careful with the changes of the non-conforming uses.

Chair Bransky stated it would make sense to keep the commercial in the commercial zones separate from the residential. For the flexibility to remove the restrictions in commercial and allow flexibility to tailor as needed and may not have it in residential vs. commercial.

Chair Bransky stated with the way it is written now it doesn't affect the existing ones in the commercial district. Chair Bransky stated it is pretty limited on what can go in.

Director Schumerth stated most of what has come in has been small, under 1,000 square feet.

Chair Bransky asked if the size could be increased with a variance or as part of the special use, or not at all.

Director Schumerth stated with a variance. And it does not include salons/spas and massage businesses. They are separate from personal service in the code.

Member Cap asked how it would affect parking and parking variances.

Director Schumerth stated it is not necessarily part of the analysis. They would see some, but not a lot. A lot of them have larger lots than what is being used and needed.

Member Cap asked if a parking variance could be asked for.

Director Schumerth stated yes.

Chair Bransky asked if a vote would be appropriate or if more time is needed for discussion.

Member Sierzega stated he would like more time.

Chair Bransky asked if it could be continued to another date and request the Board to send questions or repeat the discussion as another meeting.

Director Schumerth stated it can be continued to another meeting and Staff is available for questions.

Member O'Brien asked if the 25% was pulled from somewhere as it's an arbitrary amount. Is the 25% enough for the property owner to breakeven.

Director Schumerth stated it is an interesting question that could merit further research.

Member O'Brien asked what the conditional requests are to go to the Planning & Zoning Commission.

Director Schumerth stated they are whether or not it is appropriate for the location and the proposed restrictions/qualifications. They may want to incorporate them into the special use process.

Chair Bransky asked if the limitation is going to economically discourage anyone from using the space. But, he can see why the space would be limited as the business shouldn't overtake the primary use.

Member O'Brien stated he does not understand the second highlighted sentence on page 33.

Director Schumerth stated the definition borrows from the restaurant and rental candidate. It limits it to appointment traffic only and limited customer traffic from walk-ins. The language is a bit arcane, but it uses existing language in the code.

Chair Bransky asked for a motion to continue Case 26-47, Zoning Text Amendment for Accessory Uses in Non-Commercial Places of Assembly.

Member Cap made a motion to continue Case 26-47; and second by Member Alfonso.

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

NAYES: 0 (None)

ABSTENTIONS: 0 (None)

ABSENT: 1 (Member Johnson)

OLD BUSINESS:

None

NEW BUSINESS:

Director Schumerth stated Holladay Properties is getting close to plan submittal for the property on Chestnut. Big Rocco's on 183rd Street are about ready to move forward. There are a lot of things coming down the pipeline. There will only be one meeting in November and one meeting in December because of the holidays. There is going to be training on October 22 and the Appearance Commission will be attending.

Chair Bransky stated he attended and online chair person training and it was interesting and knowledgeable.

Chair Bransky offered Director Schumerth congratulations on his upcoming nuptials and honeymoon and added that the break is well deserved.

ADJOURN:

Chair Bransky asked for a motion to adjourn the meeting. Member Cap made a motion to adjourn; seconded by Member O'Brien. The meeting adjourned 7:58 pm.

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

NAYES: None

ABSTENTIONS: None

ABSENT: 1 (Member Johnson)

Respectfully submitted,

Darlene Leonard

Darlene Leonard
Building Department Secretary

Meeting Minutes | September 17, 2026