


VILLAGE OF ORLAND PARK

*14700 S. Ravinia Avenue
Orland Park, IL 60462
www.orlandpark.org*



Meeting Minutes

Tuesday, September 16, 2025

7:00 PM

Village Hall

Plan Commission

*Nick Parisi, Chairman
Edward Schussler, Vice Chairman
Commissioners: John J. Paul, Patrick Zomparelli, Yousef Zaatar,
Daniel Sanchez and John Nugent*

CALLED TO ORDER/ROLL CALL

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m.

Present: 7 - Chairman Parisi; Member Sanchez; Member Nugent; Member Paul; Member Schussler; Member Zaatar, Member Zomparelli

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

[Commissioner Nugent noted on the record that Pulte has been discussed before with Costco and storm water and drainage was discussed thoroughly. He also pointed out that he didn't think Costco was held accountable for their end of the bargain]

2025-0748 Minutes for the August 19, 2025 Plan Commission Meeting

A motion was made by Member Schussler, seconded by Member Zomparelli, that this matter be APPROVED. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 5 - Chairman Parisi, Member Nugent, Member Paul, Member Schussler and Member Zomparelli

Nay: 0

Abstain: 2 - Member Sanchez and Member Zaatar

PUBLIC HEARINGS**OPEN PUBLIC HEARING**

A motion was made by Chairman Parisi, seconded by Member Paul, that this matter be APPROVED. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 7 - Chairman Parisi, Member Sanchez, Member Nugent, Member Paul, Member Schussler, Member Zaatar and Member Zomparelli

Nay: 0

2025-0721 Sportsplex Zoning Map Amendment - 11351 159th Street

Planner Marcus LeVigne stated we're requesting a continuance to the October 21 meeting for this case.

Village Attorney Anne Skrodzki announced that the date and time for the continuance will be October 21 at 7:00 p.m.

A motion was made by Chairman Parisi, seconded by Member Paul, that this matter be CONTINUED to the Plan Commission due back on 10/21/2025. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 7 - Chairman Parisi, Member Sanchez, Member Nugent, Member Paul, Member Schussler, Member Zaatar and Member Zomparelli

Nay: 0

CLOSE PUBLIC HEARING

A motion was made by Chairman Parisi, seconded by Member Paul, that this matter be APPROVED. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 7 - Chairman Parisi, Member Sanchez, Member Nugent, Member Paul, Member Schussler, Member Zaatar and Member Zomparelli

Nay: 0

OPEN PUBLIC HEARING

A motion was made by Chairman Parisi, seconded by Member Paul, that this matter be APPROVED. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 7 - Chairman Parisi, Member Sanchez, Member Nugent, Member Paul, Member Schussler, Member Zaatar and Member Zomparelli

Nay: 0

2024-0676 Estates at Ravinia Meadows - Sepcial Use Permit Amendment for a Residential Planned Development

Ms. Skrodzki swore in Petitioner and Land Acquisition Manager for Pulte Homes, Fabian Fondriest. Address is 1900 East Golf Road in Schaumburg, Zip Code is 60173.

Mr. Fondriest stated it's very nice to be back here and see you all. This will be a brief presentation about updating the minor alterations to Estates of Ravinia Meadow. It's the 72 vacant acres just off the southwest corner of 159th and LaGrange. The plan that's grayed out on your left was for 132 units. I'm here tonight for a 129-unit plan. We're losing three lots (outlined in pink) to accommodate stormwater BMP that is now going to be entirely on our property. Nothing else in the plan changes. (refer to audio)

Planner Sangita Santhanam respectfully requested the staff report be accepted into the record as amended during this presentation. (refer to staff report)

Ms. Santhanam stated Pulte is back in front of this commission to request an amendment to their special use permit that was granted back in February of this year. The development remains by and large the same except that Pulte is reducing the number of units from 132 to 129. No other changes to the previously approved plan development is being requested at this time. The previously approved special use permit relied on an agreement between Costco and Pulte to allow the stormwater from the northern portion of the Pulte site to drain into Costco's pond. MWRD required that Pulte provide volume control for the northern portion of the property and Pulte was going to provide this on a Costco outlot. Unfortunately, Costco and Pulte weren't able to reach an agreement. Pulte has

modified their plans to provide the required volume control in the form of a bioswale right on the Pulte property, eliminating the need for the agreement with Costco. (refer to audio)

Ms. Santhanam stated staff recommends the Plan Commission approve a special use permit amendment for a residential planned development for Estates of Ravinia Meadows subject to conditions.

[Commissioners]

Commissioner Zaatar stated I have no comments. It's straightforward.

Commissioner Sanchez stated I agree. We kind of already went through the plan, already approved it, so no questions or concerns about this.

Commissioner Paul stated this makes sense. This was a big hangup. Costco and Pulte fighting over who's going to do what. That's what business is about. You guys negotiated it the best you could. This seems to be the best outcome. I think it's a good idea.

Commissioner Zomparelli stated it's pretty cut and dry. I just want to clarify nothing changed. You just didn't have enough space in there, right? For that little extra retention to hold that water back.

Mr. Fondriest responded exactly. Just the area required for the BMP, we were going to have it split across our property and a little bit on Costco's. That's a whole separate agreement that we couldn't come to. Now it's on our side completely.

Commissioner Zomparelli replied it's a shame. Three lots, that's a lot of money, but it is what it is.

Mr. Fondriest responded, and I want to come back here. I'll just find the next site.

Commissioner Zomparelli replied excellent. As long as you're smiling, I'm smiling. No other questions. Thank you.

Commissioner Nugent added it is straightforward. It is common, but there are things to notice consequences. The Village is losing, three families will not be living here, and each of these lots would be paying about \$15,000 in property taxes. That's \$45,000 in annual property taxes we're going to lose. Are you going to start moving dirt this year? (refer to audio)

Mr. Fondriest responded yes, our goal is to start moving dirt right away.

Commissioner Nugent replied you're behind on that.

Mr. Fondriest responded yes.

Commissioner Nugent stated it's a setback and Pulte works on formulas. I just want to point out at the end of February's meeting it was a little surprising for me and a lot of the people here and we were questioning you. It just didn't seem fair to Pulte that we were passing that approval and there were doubts about what Costco was working with and agreeing to. Dina, you're here. You can look at the minutes from our meeting and then it passed to you. I thought Pulte was entitled to have clarity on the pond and the engineering at the time of their approval. This is about a lack of cooperation from Costco. Pulte is losing three lots. They're losing three profit margins on those houses. This is a big loss for Pulte. It's zero loss for Costco. I just feel like those ducks should have been in a row in February and for Costco. I have no further questions. (refer to audio)

Chairman Parisi added in all their years here, Costco's been a very good corporate citizen for the Village.

Commissioner Schussler asked what was the reason you couldn't reach an agreement with Costco?

Mr. Fondriest responded just the terms of what that agreement would look like. We would need to take their land. They were going to plat it out and then dedicate it over to us. What that actual legal contract looked like, we couldn't come to terms on that. These things happen, but we found a solution that works.

Commissioner Schussler replied was it a matter of dollars and cents where what they wanted you to do was going to cost A and what you're doing now is B, and B was a cheaper fix.

Mr. Fondriest responded cheaper, but also just time. I mean, we're going to lose time on the agreement. We want to get going here and this was the most efficient solution.

Commissioner Schussler stated at the Costco hearing it was brought out and clearly stated there there's a problem with the Costco pond. I think you call it an SMF (Stormwater Management Facility)?

Ms. Santhanam replied that's correct.

Commissioner Schussler continued in that they have not been properly maintaining that and that has resulted in some backup of stormwater to the east over to the Chermak property. The Chermak's were indicating they were having water problems because it wasn't flowing into the pond and into Marley Creek. What are you going to do to make sure that Costco fixes the pond when they do their project with the gas facility?

Ms. Santhanam replied I defer to Village Engineer Aladdin Husain.

Mr. Husain responded first on the point with the Chermak's, I know he brought that up, but we haven't seen any evidence that the pond was actually backing into his property. His property does have wetlands, low-lying areas, so when it rains, it might just tend to stay there. As for what we're going to do with Costco, they got their preliminary engineering approval. As they're going through final engineering, they're going to submit revised plans to us for what Pulte was going to do to the pond. Pulte, as part of this agreement, was going to dredge the pond and restore the pond to its original limits.

Commissioner Schussler replied Costco is now going to do that and you're going to make sure they do it.

Mr. Husain responded correct.

Chairman Parisi added while that's not related to this petition, when they do come, it'll come back before us, won't it? When they do come to some agreement with what they're going to do with that water retention, would it come back to us?

Mr. LeVigne responded for Costco, yes. Their final ordinance requires them to complete the stormwater management.

Chairman Parisi stated I just want to make sure as Commissioner Schussler stated.

Commissioner Schussler added I just want to make sure the pond is fixed. What's the status on getting Ravinia extended over to LaGrange Road?

Mr. Husain replied that's a project that we have a consultant for. They're working on the design now. Then there's going to be some land acquisition with it. I believe the goal would be late next year.

Commissioner Schussler asked have there been any negotiations with the Chermak's with regard to dedicating the property so that they would have access to LaGrange Road for their property?

Mr. Husain responded there's been preliminary conversations I'm not privy to those to be honest.

Commissioner Schussler added so the plan is to go ahead and acquire the property by eminent domain. You're doing the engineering to figure out what you need and so on. Is that what you're saying?

Mr. Husain replied yes.

Commissioner Schussler stated that'll help the Pulte project too. It'll give you access from the east. I have no further questions.

Chairman Parisi stated I have nothing to add. I think we've discussed it thoroughly and at this point I would entertain a motion.

A motion was made by Member Schussler, seconded by Member Zomparelli, that this matter be APPROVED. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 7 - Chairman Parisi, Member Sanchez, Member Nugent, Member Paul, Member Schussler, Member Zaatar and Member Zomparelli

Nay: 0

CLOSE PUBLIC HEARING

A motion was made by Chairman Parisi, seconded by Member Paul, that this matter be APPROVED. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 7 - Chairman Parisi, Member Sanchez, Member Nugent, Member Paul, Member Schussler, Member Zaatar and Member Zomparelli

Nay: 0

NON-PUBLIC HEARINGS

OPEN NON-PUBLIC HEARING

A motion was made by Chairman Parisi, seconded by Member Paul, that this matter be APPROVED. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 7 - Chairman Parisi, Member Sanchez, Member Nugent, Member Paul, Member Schussler, Member Zaatar and Member Zomparelli

Nay: 0

2025-0707 Twin Towers Chapel Exterior Work – 9967 W. 144th Street - Certificate of Appropriateness

Ms. Skrodzki swore in Petitioners Robert West, Client Solutions Manager for Elite Exteriors, located at 226 Northwest Avenue, Elmhurst, Illinois, and Mikolaj Chlopicki, Owner of Elite Exteriors.

Chairman Parisi asked any comments or questions?

Mr. West stated the biggest thing that we wanted to address to you is that because of the historic preservation of that building, the scope of work does include only two sides of painting. Our biggest question to you is if that is something that you would allow knowing that potentially that would change the exterior of the building from a landmark standpoint because right now that is all that is quoted for from an insurance standpoint. (refer to audio)

Chairman Parisi responded thank you. We'll discuss that.

Associate Planner Hailey Gorman respectfully requested the staff report be accepted into the record as amended during this presentation. (refer to staff report)

Ms. Gorman stated the Twin Towers Chapel is seeking approval of a Certificate of Appropriateness for minor work on a landmark and contributing structure. It is within the Old Orland Historic District. The petitioner is proposing minor work which is defined as changes that do not have a substantial impact on the exterior appearance of the structure or site including alterations, additions, or removal of exterior architectural elements such as doors, windows, fences, skylights, siding, exterior stairs, roofs, tuckpointing, etc. The scope of work that's proposed for this project includes replacing the roof, gutters, and downspouts for the chapel. They also propose to replace siding in certain areas. (refer to audio)

Ms. Gorman stated staff recommends the Plan Commission approve a Certificate of Appropriateness.

Ms. Skrodzki asked Ms. Gorman, can you clarify whether staff is asking for the motion to be amended within this current case with the updated information and considered tonight for a recommendation or will it have to be amended after the Commission considers this action?

Ms. Gorman responded at this point, staff recommends the Plan Commission approve a Certificate of Appropriateness with which has not been written yet. The Plan Commission could consider amending the motion to direct staff to continue working with the petitioner to address the scope of work before they advance to the Board.

Ms. Skrodzki replied one of my questions would be does staff have clarity on what the proposed amendment would be and how it differs from the report as written. Whether it's two sides of painting or what two sides of painting.

Ms. Gorman responded the two sides of painting are not in the report.

Ms. Skrodzki replied that is how the report would have to be amended for the Certificate of Appropriateness to be amended as the petitioner is saying now, correct?

Ms. Gorman responded correct. If they want to do that, they're also saying they don't want to paint only two sides of the building. They want to paint all four sides of the building. Maybe we should amend their motion for them to continue to work with staff to revise the scope of work entirely before they advance to the Board of Trustees.

Ms. Skrodzki suggested taking a five-minute recess to see if there's a way that we can talk to petitioners and get some clarity because I want to make sure that the Commission's recommendation, whatever it ends up being, is clear or we can consider alternatives. (refer to audio)

Chairman Parisi added remember in addition to being the Plan Commission we've also taken on the responsibility of the Historic Commission, and my understanding is that by painting two sides would remove it from ...

Mr. West stated everything that we have read in regard to the historic preservation of the buildings in Orland Park, and anyone that falls under this preservation states that the painting has to match exactly during renovation to what it previously was. If you paint a building with two of four sides on it, there is no way to guarantee that all four match. There's weathering, the thermal piece behind it, and the sun hitting it for five years. We have to work within the scope of the insurance. The reason we brought this to your attention is if you don't agree with painting two of four sides, we can address this with them, but it has to be discussed at this meeting.

[Commissioners]

Commissioner Zaatar stated I think there's a difference between matching paint colors and what's in the code. (refer to audio)

Mr. West responded would you ever paint two sides of your house and leave two sides...would anybody ever paint two sides of a building and expect it to match?

Chairman Parisi added it is my understanding that the insurance will only allow for you to paint two sides. But, if this Commission required you to paint all four sides, would you think that in that case the insurance would approve it.

Mr. West responded yes. Ordinance and law coverage is part of the endorsement.

Chairman Parisi stated it's important to know.

Commissioner Schussler, my question is, to clarify, you're not stating exactly but implying that painting only two sides will remove the historic preservation status of the building. Is that what you're saying?

Mr. West responded no, I'm saying that your codes require them to be done this way to maintain that preservation status. You want that building to not lose its integrity by having two sides painted and two sides not painted, right? That's why all of the stipulations are in place, right? Replace it with previously what was there. If you paint only two sides, you will have two tones of paint on there. (refer to audio)

Commissioner Schussler replied I would like the attorney and the staff to clarify,

maybe not tonight, whether painting two sides of the building will under our code remove it as an historic building. That's pretty important with what we do tonight having the answer to that question.

Commissioner Zaatar stated our policy is for the building to match and to preserve its historic character. (refer to audio)

Chairman Parisi added it seems to me if we would require all four sides to be painted, it would match. We would cut to the chase and get it done.

Commissioner Zomparelli asked Mr. West, I'm assuming you mentioned this to the church, correct?

Mr. West responded we did. We also mentioned it directly to the insurance, but they said under their own investigation that they determined that was not required by you.

Commissioner Zomparelli replied you need us to say, "hey, yes, it's required." Then they'll cough up the cash. So, we're doing your bidding.

Mr. West responded yes, correct.

Commissioner Zomparelli stated I'm assuming now you're going to set up the scaffolding for this. It can't be that much more money looking at these pictures. Am I correct in that assumption?

Mr. West replied not a significant amount of money, but the church shouldn't necessarily be responsible for that from our understanding. That's why they have the coverage that they do. That's why we presented it to you. (refer to audio)

Assistant Development Services Director Carrie Haberstich stated I was wondering if you'd be open to or reopening the floor to have a resident speak because they have experience with insurance.

Commissioner Zaatar this has nothing to do with insurance. I object to having a resident speak. (refer to audio)

Chairman Parisi asked what were you suggesting Ms. Haberstich?

Ms. Haberstich replied if you'd be open to reopening the floor to a resident to be able to speak.

Ms. Skrodzki stated we haven't called for public comment yet.

Chairman Parisi added we haven't, but it wouldn't be a bad time. We have a public comment.

Ms. Skrodzki swore in Dina Lawrence.

Ms. Lawrence stated I'm speaking as a resident of the Village of Orland Park. I had a recent experience with an insurance company and damage and one thing I learned from the insurance company is if there is a village requirement, ordinance, etc., then the insurance must cover that item related to a repair. Something for consideration. I'm not a lawyer.

Chairman Parisi added for those of you who don't know, Ms. Lawrence is a Village Trustee. Thank you for your comment.

Commissioner Nugent stated it has to cover it if you have that as an option in your insurance and not all have it. It does depend on your individual policy. (refer to audio)

Mr. West explained law and ordinance coverage is what you would need in your policy. It's an actual endorsement on there and it'll usually kick an additional 10% of any required codes to address situations like opening a roof and there's no ice and water shield underneath. (refer to audio)

Commissioner Schussler asked does the church policy have that?

Mr. West replied yes, it does have that.

Commissioner Schussler responded good.

Mr. West continued, which is why we need to hear from you guys. Then we're good.

Chairman Parisi stated understood.

Commissioner Paul stated you need us to tell you have to so that you can go to the insurance and say they made me, and the insurance company has to pay it.

Mr. West replied yes. We have to stay in our lane.

Commissioner Paul continued if we interpret the rules that you have to do this, and we tell you have to do this then you go to the insurance company, and they have to pay for it.

Ms. Skrodzki stated, let me clarify and Ms. Gorman just double-check me, if I'm sure, this is considered minor work, but this Commission is sitting as a recommending body?

Ms. Gorman responded correct.

Ms. Skrodzki continued and it's going to the Board as well?

Ms. Gorman responded correct. I also have an amended motion if you would like to hear it as well.

Ms. Skrodzki replied perfect. When we get there, I'm sure we will appreciate that. The question would be whether we recommend the Board approval and whether that approval will encompass a recommendation that the Board require the painting of all four sides of the building. We'll add that to the recommendation on the Certificate of Appropriateness.

Chairman Parisi added that would be my preference.

Commissioner Zomparelli stated there's six sides, not four on the steeple.

Ms. Skrodzki responded façade. Do you mean façade sides?

Mr. West replied they're going to look at it from an elevation standpoint, four elevations to your property. Front, right, left, and rear.

Chairman Parisi responded good question. Thank you.

Commissioner Sanchez stated with the painting, I assume that covers the white with the trim color as well.

Mr. West replied yes. It would be encompassing of the whole property to be repainted and not just patched.

Commissioner Sanchez asked after it's painted should you paint all four sides, when would you have to paint it again? Is that going to last 10 years, 15 years in your opinion?

Mr. Chlopicki responded when we went for the inspection with the insurance adjuster, we found out there is lead behind the paint and that's how it started with the repainting.

Commissioner Zomparelli replied I didn't hear.

Mr. West responded it was lead paint.

Commissioner Zomparelli added 1898, I'm thinking it probably was.

Mr. West replied the scope of work asks us to peel off two layers of paint and then only repaint those two sides where lead was found.

Commissioner Zomparelli asked are you going to replace some of the cedar up there, right?

Mr. Chlopicki responded 100%.

Commissioner Zomparelli replied they're rotten or just beat up?

Mr. Chlopicki responded both.

Commissioner Zomparelli asked is there a percentage of how many? Like 25% of them, give or take? The reason why I'm asking is because when you're dealing with lead, you'd almost be better off just pulling all that off and just resealing the whole thing. Would you not?

Mr. Chlopicki replied 100%. If the insurance carrier is willing to pay for that that's what we're going to do.

Commissioner Zomparelli stated that's what makes sense to me. Matching it up, I'm looking at some of these pictures, not so much. That's where I stand. I think that if you're going to do it, get this done right. Good luck.

Commissioner Nugent stated a couple of clarifications for the record, Ms. Gorman, between what you spoke, what's in the report, what's in our printed report, what's in their estimate, and their testimony, we have inconsistencies. Just to clarify, we've said things like we're replacing the siding. This is about the historic nature of it. How much siding is being replaced? As far as I'm aware, that property is 100% wood, assuming it's all cedar. Correct?

Mr. West responded correct.

Commissioner Nugent continued when we say siding, we need to clarify. How much of the cedar siding, not the shakes, how much of the cedar siding on the four sides, excluding the top part of the steeple, how much are you replacing?

Mr. Chlopicki replied they didn't cover any of that.

Mr. West added no scallop shakes were replaced. When it comes to the actual cedar wood, that's where they expect us to scrape the two layers of paint off and paint two sides of the building, basically directional from the storm, those two sides.

Chairman Parisi asked the cedar will be scraped and repainted?

Mr. West responded that's a whole different thing, but yes.

Commissioner Nugent continued on the chapel estimate for the siding from your

company, it says remove and replace cedar siding. The clapboard siding is probably top two of the historic elements of this property. Are you taking off the 100-year-old cedar siding and not putting it back? Are you taking any clapboard off?

Mr. West responded no, scallop siding. The cedar siding, that's on there.

Commissioner Nugent asked when it says remove and replace cedar siding, that's only the scallops?

Mr. West responded yes. It's only on the top of the towers.

Commissioner Nugent stated you're saying the scallops are cedar, right?

Mr. West replied yes.

Commissioner Nugent asked and the new material will be cedar?

Mr. West replied yes.

Commissioner Nugent continued and you're leaving the clapboard and the dispute with the clapboard is that they claim that two sides of it are lead.

Mr. West responded yes, scraped and painted. Two sides.

Commissioner Nugent stated even on the two Twin Towers, clapboard siding remains?

Mr. West replied yes.

Commissioner Nugent continued the only insulation wrap is on the scallop ornamentation, right?

Mr. West replied yes.

Commissioner stated nothing against your estimate, it's not my field, it's half a million dollars, the word minor has to do with whether or not we're changing the historic nature of the property. That's the minor word, right?

Ms. Gorman responded correct.

Commissioner Nugent continued that's a big deal.

Ms. Gorman replied correct. The estimate does include both buildings on the property. That could be why too.

Commissioner Nugent asked on the flashings, is it currently aluminum? Are you going to aluminum? There's no copper or any other material?

Mr. Chlopicki responded nothing that we found right now was copper.

Commissioner Nugent asked it's aluminum to aluminum?

Mr. Chlopicki replied yes.

Commissioner Nugent asked and the gutters are what material now?

Mr. Chlopicki responded the gutters are going to be detached and reset. That's what they're paying for.

Commissioner Nugent asked you're putting the same gutters back?

Mr. Chlopicki replied they paid for detach and reset.

Commissioner Nugent stated literally two sides of this siding, you would not touch, you would do nothing.

Mr. Chlopicki responded as of right now, yes. That's why we are here.

Commissioner Nugent continued and the other two, as far as the painting process, because it's lead you have to go through a lead abatement process?

Mr. Chlopicki replied correct.

Commissioner Nugent stated OK, I'm good.

Commissioner Schussler stated we don't have that many historic buildings in Orland Park. I'm in favor of any motion that preserves the historic status of the building.

Chairman Parisi replied thank you. I agree with Commissioner Schussler. I would entertain a motion to that effect.

Commissioner Zaatar stated I'm a little nervous about this one. It seems like we're trying to help with an insurance claim. I assume this is a hailstorm claim, is that correct?

Mr. Chlopicki and Mr. West responded yes.

Commissioner Zaatar continued frankly speaking, I don't think the building will lose its historic status over what building is repainting or what such building is not repainting. That's my opinion. I don't think the building will lose its historic status.

Chairman Parisi responded but you don't know that. You can't guarantee that.

Commissioner Schussler added that's his opinion.

Chairman Parisi agreed that's his opinion. It is a possibility if they just did two sides. In sight of what's in your reference to what's within our responsibilities, it's our responsibility to retain historic status.

Commissioner Zaatar stated I think we're trying to figure out if we're going to have that discussion. (refer to audio)

Chairman Parisi replied right. I see your reasoning.

Commissioner Zaatar continued, this battle with the insurance company, is not our battle. It's not our policy. We need to clarify that the owner of the building is well aware of our intentions. (refer to audio)

Mr. West responded to clarify, the owner of the building is well aware our intentions of this and knows that if we come to you with the expectation that we're presenting two of four sides being painted and you've determined that not to be the case, yes, there is precedent in Illinois across it, but if by chance the insurance does deny for some unforeseen reason, they are aware that we would still have to paint four sides.

Commissioner Zaatar replied what we determine today is not that but if we say you're going to paint all four sides to preserve the historic status, and the insurance doesn't cover it then they can paint all four sides. We should keep the insurance out of our discussion. (refer to audio)

Mr. West responded we are not asking you to determine this from an insurance standpoint. We are just asking if you believe that painting two sides brings a devaluation of that property. (refer to audio)

Chairman Parisi added first of all, I don't feel that the conversation we had, I don't think our goal was to save the church the money to paint the other two sides. I think the conversation was we wanted to make sure we preserve its historic status. My question to the petitioner is, if this went unamended, would the church be going ahead and painting all four sides or would they just paint two?

Commissioner Schussler added no, he said they'd paint four.

Mr. West responded if you address it and say that it has to be...

Chairman Parisi replied no, if we don't say that.

Mr. West responded no, realistically, we're going to go with what the insurance piece says.

Chairman Parisi asked you would only paint two sides?

Mr. West replied yes. It's not about the dollar amount that you approve.

Chairman Parisi added we're not approving a dollar amount.

Mr. West responded exactly. We're asking you if we believe that it's a devaluation of that historic building by only painting two sides of the four in the community.

Chairman Parisi replied understood. Thank you for that. Any other comments from my Commissioners?

Commissioner Schussler stated perhaps it'll clarify a lot of things if we hear the recommended staff motion that she's prepared. That might answer a lot of our questions. Can you read that Ms. Gorman?

Chairman Parisi added before you do, I have one more Commissioner with a question.

Commissioner Paul stated I just want to make sure we have the insurance part squared away and I don't really care about the insurance. We're not adjusters. That's none of our business. The idea of painting four sides versus two per ordinance. What's the requirement? Is that the paint matches? Is that the rule?

Chairman Parisi added that's what is says.

Commissioner Paul continued that's the rule. However, it happens that the paint matches, that's good. If the paint doesn't match, then that's a problem? Am I on the right track here?

Ms. Gorman responded yes.

Commissioner Paul stated the rule is that the paint has to mach. It's not about two sides or four sides. Am I correct?

Mr. LeVigne replied yes. All materials are supposed to match on buildings, and the paint is supposed to withstand a 25-year weather period as well. That's in our design standards.

Commissioner Paul stated I get it. You want to keep the integrity as much as you can, but roofs don't last 100 years. Is there a way for the paint to match without painting four sides? (refer to audio)

Mr. West responded you'd have to weather it by five years, and I don't know if that's possible. (refer to audio)

Commissioner Paul replied it seems like our direction here is the colors have to match.

Mr. West responded yes.

Commissioner Paul continued you, the church, the insurance company, sounds like it's for you guys to figure out. We're saying when it's all said and done, the colors have to match.

Mr. Chlopicki stated we just don't want it to end up, you guys saying let's do two sides and you come for a final inspection and say it doesn't match. What's next?

Chairman Parisi commented our way of ensuring that they match is by requiring all four sides. We have a comment from our attorney.

Ms. Skrodzki stated I was going to cite the section in the code that discusses the design standards in Old Orland Historic District for historic structures, which is 6-209.F, deals with siding, brick, and trim. Not only does it say materials for siding, brick, and trim should match and be compatible in character color and texture with the original, but we also have a requirement that specifically light paint colors should be used for siding that will not conceal the shadow lines of the narrow clapboards and the decorative trim. Painted wood trim is preferred with simple flat trim for doors and windows. Throughout there are numerous design standards including the sections regarding windows, porches, and other trim that specify that all the paint should match. I also want to comment that the Certificate of Appropriateness standard is not necessarily specifically tied to the preservation or loss of historic status. It's about what the Village feels is appropriate to preserve the character which may go beyond a minimum standard of what is acceptable.

Chairman Parisi responded thank you.

Ms. Skrodzki replied thank you.

Chairman Parisi asked do you have the amended motion?

Ms. Gorman responded we have a recommendation. Yes, we do.

Chairman Parisi asked and that is?

Ms. Gorman replied it's similar to the existing one. I want to pull it up for reference. We have the staff recommended action and then addition to that with the condition that the entire building is repainted and for the recommended motion, instead of

as presented in the staff report to the Plan Commission for this case, it could be as amended during this Plan Commission meeting. You could also add a condition if you would like them to paint the building. (refer to audio)

Chairman Parisi asked we're talking about the four sides, right?

Commissioner Schussler stated why don't we take a break and let Ms. Skrodzki give us a motion that's specific.

Ms. Skrodzki replied that's fine. I can do that.

Ms. Gorman added absolutely.

Ms. Skrodzki stated I'll write it out. Give me just a second.

Commissioner Nugent asked did we approve Hardi Board with their insurance claim for the Victorian mansion in the historic district? The Loebe House. (refer to audio)

Mr. LeVigne responded I believe we did, but that was because of the same. It was the same color and style on the building.

Commissioner Nugent stated they took off clapboard, but we allowed them to put on Hardi Board. Just as a point of note what everyone's referencing.

Mr. LeVigne replied yes that one's a contributing structure. It's not like a national register of historic places or anything like that. We would allow that minor change, which is why it went to Plan Commission.

Commissioner Nugent stated I know after we did all the studies, they get our first tier. They're considered our most historic house, but they don't have national. Is that the only thing that has national?

Ms. Gorman responded no. This property does, but also the John Humphrey House does.

Commissioner Nugent replied right. But Loebe doesn't? That's right on the corner across the street from them. That's why we allowed them to have Hardi Board?

Mr. LeVigne responded that's correct.

Commissioner Schussler stated Mr. Chairman I would move that we table this to the end of the meeting and proceed with the rest of the agenda while the attorney writes up the motion.

Chairman Parisi responded we're just about there.

Commissioner Schussler stated I will withdraw my motion. I was trying to give you enough time.

Chairman Parisi added I just want us to remember we're more than just the Plan Commission, we get the historic designations, and everything comes under our purview as well. It's a necessary discussion to have had.

Commissioner Zomparelli stated I just want to put my two cents. I don't really like to get in the middle of an insurance claim. I don't think that is our privy. (refer to audio)

Chairman Parisi added I don't feel we're making a decision based on an insurance claim or based on a financial obligation, we're making our decision based on...

Commissioner Zomparelli stated what I was going to say was historical reference. (refer to audio)

Chairman Parisi added and that's why we're requiring regardless of who pays for it.

Commissioner Zomparelli replied exactly.

Chairman Parisi stated it's a good clarification.

Commissioner Zaatar stated that's exactly what my thought was. I just want to make it very clear that whether they lost in this insurance battle, that's the direction for what we consider to be historic preservation.

Commissioner Zomparelli added correct.

Chairman Parisi stated we're all on the same page.

Ms. Skrodzki stated I'm going to read into the record the amended staff recommended action regarding case number 2025-0707, also known as Twin Towers Exterior Work, staff recommends to accept and make findings of fact as discussed at this Plan Commission meeting and within the staff report dated September 11, 2025, and staff recommends the Plan Commission recommend approval of a Certificate of Appropriateness with the condition that the entire building is repainted.

Regarding Case Number 2025-0707, also known as Twin Towers Chapel Exterior Work, I move to approve the Staff Recommended Action as presented in the Staff Report to the Plan Commission for this case.

A motion was made by Chairman Parisi, seconded by Member Paul, that this matter be APPROVED AS AMENDED DURING THE PRESENTATION AND AS READ INTO THE RECORD BY OUR ATTORNEY. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 7 - Chairman Parisi, Member Sanchez, Member Nugent, Member Paul, Member Schussler, Member Zaatar and Member Zomparelli

Nay: 0

CLOSE NON-PUBLIC HEARING

A motion was made by Chairman Parisi, seconded by Member Paul, that this matter be APPROVED. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 7 - Chairman Parisi, Member Sanchez, Member Nugent, Member Paul, Member Schussler, Member Zaatar and Member Zomparelli

Nay: 0

OPEN PUBLIC HEARING

A motion was made by Chairman Parisi, seconded by Member Paul, that this matter be APPROVED. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 7 - Chairman Parisi, Member Sanchez, Member Nugent, Member Paul, Member Schussler, Member Zaatar and Member Zomparelli

Nay: 0

2025-0619 Proposed Land Development Code Amendment - Special Uses for Restaurants within 300' of Residential Parcels

Planner Sangita Santhanam respectfully requested the staff report be accepted into the record as amended during this presentation. (refer to staff report)

Ms. Santhanam stated the overarching goal for this amendment is to allow restaurants as permitted uses if certain criteria are met. In the Land Development Code, many of the non-residential zoning districts require specialized permits for restaurants that are located within 300' of a residential parcel. Such restaurants are located in strip malls with other restaurants and/or replace previously approved restaurants in the same tenant space. The goal for this amendment is to allow these restaurants to become permitted uses and not be classified as a special use requiring special use approvals. Any restaurant with a drive-thru or outdoor seating will require a special use approval. (refer to audio)

Ms. Santhanam stated staff recommends the Plan Commission approve the Land Development Code Amendment as presented in the staff report dated September 16, 2025.

[Commissioners]

Commissioner Schussler stated this is an excellent proposal from the staff. When you're a trustee, as our sole occupant in the audience is, of which I used to be, or you're a Plan Commission member, it's easy to forget that the requirements that we put on businesses all have a dollar figure attached to them. We make it difficult if we have requirements that are just check the box type thing that are time-consuming. I commend the staff for identifying this and putting it before us and I'm all in favor of it. (refer to audio)

Commissioner Zomparelli stated I agree with Commissioner Schussler. Excellent job. Nice and clear. The fact that you're saving two to three months, beautiful, \$500 to \$1,000, great. Anything we can do to help businesses because they're having a tough time. Kudos to you guys. (refer to audio)

Commissioner Paul stated it's nice to see a unit of government reducing red tape because you don't see that a lot. Obviously, if we're dealing with something that involves alcohol or later hours, there are already ordinances and regulations that would cover that. That would be my only concern, but we have that covered. (refer to audio)

Commissioner Nugent stated I'm addressing all of you and Commissioner Zaatar. The Indian deli at 158th and Wolf, the coffee café at 155th and 94th Avenue, and the popcorn shop on 151st, we had those discussions each time and we raised successively in those three the increase and Steve Marciani was at the third and we said, "Steve, where are we going with this?" Staff needs to make a recommendation and get it before Board. We're spending time and money and delay in opening. I don't think the popcorn shop is open and the coffee shop hasn't opened yet either, right? (refer to audio)

Ms. Santhanam responded I think they're under review for building permits.

Commissioner Nugent added thank you for getting it done. (refer to audio)

Commissioner Zaatar stated it has been frustrating for six years talking about this and I think one of the benefits we should note is that there are a lot of businesses that run away because of the special use permit and now they won't. Thank you to staff.

Commissioner Sanchez added I think it's a great idea.

Chairman Parisi added I agree. I think one of our responsibilities outside of our responsibilities to Village codes and ordinances and everything is our responsibility to our community and our business members. I think this is a move in the right direction. It's a good motion. (refer to audio)

Commissioner Nugent commented on the coffee shop approval that stated they

may want a drive-through in the future and stated drive-throughs don't belong next to townhouse complexes. (refer to audio)

A motion was made by Member Schussler, seconded by Member Paul, that this matter be APPROVED. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 7 - Chairman Parisi, Member Sanchez, Member Nugent, Member Paul, Member Schussler, Member Zaatar and Member Zomparelli

Nay: 0

CLOSE PUBLIC HEARING

A motion was made by Chairman Parisi, seconded by Member Zomparelli, that this matter be APPROVED. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 7 - Chairman Parisi, Member Sanchez, Member Nugent, Member Paul, Member Schussler, Member Zaatar and Member Zomparelli

Nay: 0

OPEN PUBLIC HEARING

A motion was made by Chairman Parisi, seconded by Member Paul, that this matter be APPROVED. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 7 - Chairman Parisi, Member Sanchez, Member Nugent, Member Paul, Member Schussler, Member Zaatar and Member Zomparelli

Nay: 0

2025-0746 Land Development Code Amendment – Allow Outdoor Fireplaces in all Zoning Districts

Planner Marcus LeVigne respectfully requested the staff report be accepted into the record as amended during this presentation. (refer to staff report)

Mr. LeVigne stated the purpose of this amendment is to allow outdoor fireplaces within all zoning districts in the Village. Right now, outdoor fireplaces are currently prohibited in the Village Center District as well as the General Business District. This amendment would allow outdoor fireplaces within all zoning districts in rear yards unless it's a restaurant, then it can be permitted elsewhere on-site currently as the code reads. All proposed outdoor fireplaces are still subject to applicable Village codes including the International Building Code and International Fire Code regulations. Non-residential and multi-family applications for an outdoor fireplace are still required to apply for an Appearance Review. Also, the same process as before. (refer to audio)

Mr. LeVigne stated staff recommends the Plan Commission approve the Land Development Code Amendment as presented in the staff report dated September

12, 2025.

Chairman Parisi stated I see this is now saying that we will allow outdoor fireplaces in all zoning districts. Is there reference in our fire code that addresses the size and the magnitude to allow?

Mr. LeVigne responded yes, that's correct.

Chairman Parisi added because that's important.

Mr. LeVigne replied yes. The International Fire Code has its own setbacks and regulations as well as the International Building Code. Our code says a minimum of 5' from the lot line, but I believe it's at least 15' from a building from the International Building Code.

Chairman Parisi responded OK, which we abide by.

Mr. LeVigne replied correct.

Chairman Parisi stated just thought I needed to ask that question. Thank you.

Commissioner Zomparelli stated I think it's great. I like my outdoor fire pit. Thank you. Especially with Weber coming in. I'm glad you had the insight on that. That's a great place to have an outdoor fire pit. That's all.

Commissioner Nugent stated we set the national standard on encouraging outdoor dining during COVID and this is a trend that was always there, and it's been expanded. People love being outside and we need to make sure we can accommodate this as often as we can.

Commissioner Schussler stated another good example of streamlining the code. Good job.

Commissioner Sanchez stated I'm also pro fireplace.

Commissioner Paul stated getting rid of some red tape was good, getting rid of more is better.

Chairman Parisi added I agree with my fellow Commissioners. Another good move.

Commissioner Zaatar stated I like the idea.

Regarding Case Number 2025-0746, also known as Land Development Code Amendment - Allow Outdoor Fireplaces in all Zoning Districts, I move to approve the Staff Recommended Action as presented in the Staff Report to the Plan

Commission for this case.

A motion was made by Member Schussler, seconded by Member Zomparelli, that this matter be APPROVED. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 7 - Chairman Parisi, Member Sanchez, Member Nugent, Member Paul, Member Schussler, Member Zaatar and Member Zomparelli

Nay: 0

CLOSE PUBLIC HEARING

A motion was made by Chairman Parisi, seconded by Member Paul, that this matter be APPROVED. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 7 - Chairman Parisi, Member Sanchez, Member Nugent, Member Paul, Member Schussler, Member Zaatar and Member Zomparelli

Nay: 0

OTHER BUSINESS

2025-0747 Memo: New Petitions

NON-SCHEDULED CITIZENS & VISITORS

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 8:23 p.m.

A motion was made by Chairman Parisi, seconded by Member Zomparelli, that this matter be ADJOURNED. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 7 - Chairman Parisi, Member Sanchez, Member Nugent, Member Paul, Member Schussler, Member Zaatar and Member Zomparelli

Nay: 0