



Village of Hanover Park Administration

Municipal Building
2121 West Lake Street, Hanover Park, IL 60133
630-823-5600 tel 630-823-5786 fax

hpil.org

Village President
Rodney S. Craig

Village Clerk
Kristy Merrill

Trustees
Troy Albuck
Yasmeen Bankole
Jenni Broccolino
Liza Gutierrez
Jon Kunkel
Herb Porter

Interim Village Manager
Courtney Sage

VILLAGE OF HANOVER PARK DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION - REGULAR MEETING

**2121 Lake Street, Hanover Park, IL
Municipal Building, Room 214**

**Thursday, April 9, 2026
7:00 pm**

AGENDA

- 1. CALL TO ORDER: ROLL CALL**
- 2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**
- 3. ACCEPTANCE OF AGENDA**
- 4. PRESENTATIONS/REPORTS: None**
- 5. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – March 12, 2026**
- 6. TOWNHALL SESSION:** Persons wishing to address the public body must register prior to Call to Order. Public comment limited to 5 minutes per speaker.
- 7. NEW BUSINESS:**
 - 7-a. Discussion on Future Zoning Code Amendments – Village Center Façade Standards**
 - 7-b. Re-discussion of a Recommended Approval of a Text Amendment to Permit Some Level 3 EV Charging Stations as Permitted Accessory Uses**
- 8. DEVELOPMENT UPDATES**
- 9. ADJOURNMENT**



Village of Hanover Park Administration

Municipal Building
2121 West Lake Street, Hanover Park, IL 60133
630-823-5600 tel 630-823-5786 fax

hpil.org

Village President
Rodney S. Craig

Village Clerk
Kristy Merrill

Trustees
Troy Albuck
Yasmeen Bankole
Jenni Broccolino
Liza Gutierrez
Jon Kunkel
Herb Porter

Interim Village Manager
Courtney Sage

VILLAGE OF HANOVER PARK DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION – REGULAR MEETING

**Village Hall, Room 214
Hanover Park IL**

**Thursday, March 12, 2026
7:00 pm**

MINUTES

1. CALL TO ORDER: ROLL CALL

Chair Serauskas called the meeting to order at 7:04 pm

PRESENT: Commissioners: Ray Alvarez, Tom Clark, Theresa Palazzo, Chair
Serauskas

ABSENT: Commissioners: Chris Bjorkman, Vice Chair Watkins

ALSO PRESENT: Director Govind, Planner Schwartz, Associate
Planner Subovitz, Sr. Admin Sjodin, Stephen
Capela, Trustee Albuck

2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE: Recital of the Pledge of Allegiance.

3. ACCEPTANCE OF AGENDA

Motion by Commissioner Alvarez and second by Commissioner Clark to accept the
Agenda.

Voice Vote: All Ayes.

Motion passes.

4. PRESENTATIONS/REPORTS: none

5. APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

Motion by Commissioner Alvarez, seconded by Commissioner Clark to approve the
Minutes of January 8, 2026 (no meeting in February).

Voice Vote: All Ayes.

Motion passes.

6. TOWN HALL SESSION: none

7. NEW BUSINESS:

7-a. Discussion of Potential Future Zoning Code Amendments for Consideration – Village Center Façade Grant Standards

Planner Schwartz reviewed the prior discussion regarding facades from August 14, 2025 and items that have already been implemented included:

- Reducing the 50% balcony enclosure requirement
- Increasing the 30% maximum balcony façade coverage
- When a Minor Design Exception is granted, excluding a 20' driveway from the 80% façade coverage requirement
- Some Level 3 EV chargers for administrative approval

Staff is now requesting discussion regarding certain Village Center façade standards. Currently there are 4 groups of materials in the Village Code:

1. Major Façade Materials – 70%
2. Minor Façade Materials – 30%
3. Accent Materials
4. Prohibited Materials

Planner Schwartz noted that both the recent Village Center development proposals received design exceptions for façade materials. The Synergy project asked for TIF assistance and using some of the of required materials would have increased the ask.

Chair Serauskas commented that the lifespan of the products we allow and their durability in our weather is important. He asked Chief Capela if composite and fiber cement board (HardieBoard) are acceptable materials and believes the fiber cement board available today is a great material with minimal maintenance and is insect-proof.

Chief Capela commented that composite is like plastic, with a mix of sawdust and polymer, it's maintenance-free, resists rot, decay and UV damage, and has a 50+ year lifespan. He said fiber cement board is more like particle board material and is not the best for wet climates. Chief Capela added that materials such as simulated brick and stone are like vinyl siding; very durable, great longevity, and it is currently thicker than it used to be so now has a much longer lifespan.

Planner Schwartz commented that vinyl siding is better today than it was 40 years ago, it requires less maintenance than brick or wood especially when using it to reside a building or residence.

Commissioner Palazzo said simulated materials are easier to maintain and stay looking nice for a long time.

Commissioner Alvarez asked why simulated materials were left out as a permitted material in the past. Director Govind commented that Backstreet BBQ's façade is simulated wood and looks very nice. The original list of approved materials may have reflected a cautious approach.

DISCUSSION QUESTIONS FOR COMMISSIONERS

1. Is wood or composite an acceptable Major Façade Material for General Buildings?
2. Is fiber cement board an acceptable Major Façade Material for General Buildings?
3. Are either materials (wood or composite) acceptable if the building is not only one material?

Chief Capela stated that wood is currently only allowed up to a certain height due to its combustibility factor per the Building Code.

Director Govind stated that currently the Village Center Code does not allow wood or composite wood on general buildings. Everclean car wash, which was built before the new Village Center Code, has a large amount of composite wood on the building and it looks very nice. If composite wood were to be allowed the Building Code would come into play and would be only allowed to a certain point.

Commissioner Clark commented that wood looks good when it is new, but can the Commission decide what type of materials to allow based on longevity? Director Govind answered yes, we can do that.

Planner Schwartz said that currently the Code says wood or composite wood are not allowed, but the two materials could be separated since composite wood seems to be more accepted due to its durability.

Commissioner Alvarez was concerned that a developer may then just want to use whatever materials are cheaper rather than being concerned with longevity.

Commissioner Clark asked if we should specify the longevity of materials allowed in the Code such as materials that will last 20+ years for example? Director Govind said part of it would depend on maintenance and we do already have maintenance codes regarding upkeep.

Director Govind commented that with Backstreet BBQ, their goal was to have a look similar to Texas Roadhouse buildings, which are made with long lasting materials. Chief Capela noted that Backstreet BBQ's façade is made of cedar fence pickets.

Planner Schwartz asked the Commission about simulated materials in general; inquiring whether the Village should require a Design Exception request for any simulated materials, or whether the Commission was comfortable with an easier way to allow simulated products of a material that is already permitted.

Regarding real vs simulated brick, Director Govind commented it is very difficult to tell the difference just by looking at it. Technology has come a long way with it. Our Code currently does not allow for veneer brick or veneer stone. These materials are easier to install, lighter weight, weather resistant, and much easier to maintain.

Chief Capela mentioned Nova brick, which is a brick product that is meant to be stacked on top of each other and are a thick, V-shaped pattern, mortar-free, more water and weather resistant, and long-lasting. It's a "simulated" brick product. These types of products are purely used for looks since they do not provide any additional strength to a structure, however. Director Govind added that historically, brick and stone were used for their strength on load-bearing walls of the structure. Today's buildings are using brick and stone for aesthetics mostly.

Commissioner Palazzo was concerned that a developer may choose a cheap knock-off version of a product that will ultimately look cheap and not hold up well.

Planner Schwartz replied that staff could stipulate that if indistinguishable simulation versions of permitted materials are used, that would be permitted, and alternatively, another option is the materials could be permitted with a Minor Design Exception. That way we can physically view the material ahead of time and determine if it is acceptable in quality.

The next discussion point Planner Schwartz presented is street vs. non-street facades. There are 3 categories of facades with their own requirements:

1. **Street and primary facades** – (the façade of a building along a street) – require 70% Major Materials, and a max of certain Minor Materials
2. **Non-street facades** – (the façade of a building not along a street, including interior side and rear facades. These facades may be visible from a publicly accessible place) – require 70% Major Materials, any Minor Materials.
3. **Facades not visible from any public space** – (a subcategory of “non-street facades” which cannot be seen from any public space) – same as above, but may have less with a Major Exception

Discussion Questions:

1. Should the Village require the same types of materials on ALL sides of a building, regardless of visibility?
2. Can building facades *not* visible to the public be built with more flexibility?

Chair Serauskas commented that requiring the same material on all four sides would be nice but would be very costly for a builder. We could have them use the same materials on non-public sides, but not in the same percentage amount required on sides visible to the public. The idea would be to strike a nice balance in materials to keep the architectural consistency. Keep a higher standard for street facing facades.

Director Govind agreed that requiring less than the 70% of the major materials for the non-public facing facades would be a solution as long as the same materials were being used on public and non-public sides. Having a variety of materials is also important.

Commissioner Palazzo said she has seen buildings with all four sides not made of the same materials and they look very nice. A Minor Design exception would be a good solution to ensure quality materials are used.

Director Govind pointed out that the Ignite Medical Resort building is about 60% brick, not the 70%; is it acceptable looking and aesthetically pleasing?

Planner Schwartz commented that based on this discussion staff will provide the Commission with final recommendations for the next meeting in April.

7-b. Feedback on the February 11th Awards Dinner event

Commissioners liked the format and the formal sit-down dinner and agreed the event should be kept formal (no BBQ style). They also felt the youth and young adult participation was an important part of the event and should be continued. For dinner they liked to sit with people they knew, but having appetizers in a separate room with tall tables could encourage more interaction and networking. The time and date were acceptable too.

The Commission thought the sound system was poor and did not work well at all. The appetizers were not distributed very well to all attendees; only certain areas of the room seemed to get them.

Overall, they were all pleased with the event.

8. DEVELOPMENT UPDATES

8-a. EV Charging Stations

Chair Serauskas commented that he met with Village Attorney Bernie after returning from his vacation, shortly before the Board meeting, and Bernie said he could not write the Ordinance as it was previously discussed. Chair Serauskas

agreed to having the matter sent back, as he could not comment on the matter as he was not at the Public Hearing meeting.

Director Govind reviewed the Commission's prior feedback and staff survey regarding EV charging being allowed by right in most other communities. She said the Commission had agreed that "as long as only 4 or fewer parking spaces were served by the chargers, there was not an issue." Also, if it was a non-conforming parking lot, as long as allowing the EV chargers would not increase the non-conformity (meaning not reducing the total number of parking spaces further) the Commission had found it acceptable. But if allowing EV chargers would remove parking spaces and make the parking lot even more non-conforming, it would not be acceptable.

Director Govind said Attorney Paul's concern was what if a parking lot only has 4 spaces, and all 4 spaces are served by EV chargers? There would not be any spaces for gas vehicles since EV spaces are not to be used by non-electric vehicles per the law. She said per the research survey Associate Planner Subovitz conducted on other communities and EV providers, Ionna (an EV provider) said they prioritized locating their chargers near highways or major roads. Most people charge their vehicles at home, but when people are out and about or going on a trip, having highly visible locations is important. Larger parking lots like those at a Target store or Menards generate more use and revenue. So a tiny parking lot would not be a probable option for their selection. Ionna and the survey also indicated that each EV charger costs roughly \$200,000+, so the EV companies make their location decisions based on projected use.

Another scenario/example is what if a property is required to have 19 spaces and only has 15 (a legally non-conforming lot), could 4 spaces still be used for EV charging? EV charging spaces still count toward the total number of spaces legally required. The number of spaces are not being reduced, just the number of spaces available for gasoline vehicles.

Director Govind asked the Commission about any concerns if a lot has 4 or fewer spaces? Planner Schwartz commented Hanover Park does not have any parking lots with only 4 spaces or less. There are likely only a couple places that have less than 10 spaces.

Commissioner Clark commented the owner of a property would not want EV chargers to take away spaces from customers with gas vehicles. So this may not be an issue if owner is not inclined.

Trustee Albuck gave some input on the topic, saying EV is new technology and less than 10% of cars are EV right now. The EV companies only looked at 100 target communities across the country for potential EV charging locations. Hanover Park was a good target due to our location, being the "corner" of everything. There has also been pushback against EV, and some EV stations have been vandalized and stolen for the materials. Our crime rate is low so we were in the top 100 target locations for EV chargers. He believes we should therefore definitely promote EV charging.

Director Govind said the Commission needs to determine if and how the recommendation should be altered. Attorney Paul recommended adding a phrase: "Installations of 4 or fewer EV chargers must have at least the same

number of spaces available for non-electric vehicles.” She also noted that if the Commission is happy with what they recommended in January, that is ok too.

Most Commissioners did not see an issue with leaving the original verbiage as is, however, Chair Serauskas said Attorney Paul’s language should just be added and that way everyone will be satisfied and we can move forward.

8-b. Other Development Updates

Director Govind commented that for the South Commuter Lot, staff has issued a call for developers. A new developer can either start where Synergy left it and build on it or bring something new and different. The deadline for proposals was at the end of February.

9. ADJOURNMENT

Motion by Commissioner Alvarez and seconded by Commissioner Clark to adjourn the meeting.

Voice Roll Call Vote: All Ayes.

Motion carried: Meeting adjourned at 8:32 pm

Transcribed by:

Kathy Sjodin
Sr. Admin. Assistant
March 12, 2026

Chair Serauskas



AGENDA MEMORANDUM

TO: Chairman Serauskas and Development Commissioners *Hanover Park^{USA}*
FROM: Shubhra Govind, Director of Community & Economic Development
Alex Schwartz, Village Planner

**SUBJECT: Discussion on Future Zoning Code Amendments – Village Center
Façade Standards**

ACTION

REQUESTED: ☐ Approval ☐ Concurrence ☒ Discussion ☐ Information

MEETING DATE: April 9, 2026

The Development Commission is tasked with evaluating the Village's Zoning Code to ensure it is consistent with the Village's vision. Following review of recent development proposals, Staff is requesting discussion on façade materials and other building design requirements in the Village Center Code.

No formal action is requested during this meeting. A workshop may be scheduled in the future to discuss these topics in more detail if further discussion is required.

Background

On March 12th, the Development Commission discussed several potential changes with respect to Village Center façade requirements. The Village Center Code currently requires that buildings be constructed with at least 70% of the façade comprising an "allowed Major Façade Material". Any other material must be an "allowed Minor Façade Material, with specific limitations on the amount:

Staff has noted potential areas for discussion. In particular:

1. The Code permits wood or composite wood on Yard and Row Building types, but not on General Buildings. Two of three recently proposed General Buildings have requested and been granted Design Exceptions for wood or similar materials.
2. Fiber Cement Board is an increasingly common material among buildings in suburban downtowns but is also prohibited on General Buildings
3. Simulated materials (simulated brick, wood, stone, etc.) are becoming more visually indistinguishable from natural variety.
4. The Code requires the same treatment of non-street facades as street facades.
5. There are potential conflicts between the minimum required Major Façade Materials and the permitted Minor Façade Materials.

After detailed discussions, the Development Commission came to the following conclusions:

1. While they are currently treated the same way in the Code, wood and simulated wood are not the same material. Simulated wood has a greater durability that is acceptable on general buildings while natural wood may not.
2. Fiber cement board is a suitable material, commonly used in contemporary buildings. It may be preferable to wood in some circumstances due to its durability.
3. Minor exceptions may be appropriate for simulated materials, particularly if they are durable and indistinguishable from natural materials.
4. Facades less visible from the public may have a lower standard of façade materials, as long as Staff is able to review proposals.

The Commission also discussed how the standards were meant to lead to higher quality development but not serve as a barrier.

Discussion

Based on the Commission's discussion, Staff is making the following recommendations. Please note, there are some additional discussion questions for topics where Staff needs additional input.

1. Permit fiber cement board as a Major Material

Staff is proposing to add fiber cement board as an allowed major façade material for General Buildings.

TABLE 9-5.A. ALLOWED MAJOR FACADE MATERIALS				
MAJOR FACADE MATERIAL	BUILDING TYPES			
	GENERAL, CIVIC BUILDINGS	ROW BUILDINGS	YARD BUILDINGS	
A Brick full dimensional, economy, unit, face brick	●	●	●	
B Concrete Masonry Units architectural, minimum 3" depth, "artisan stone" look, varied sizes, (Eschelon Masonry or approved equal), "stone" face, "hewn stone", rock cut	●	●	—	
C Fiber Cement Board panels, finished lap siding or shingles	●	●	●	
D Glass curtain wall	●	●	—	
E Metal, Architectural architectural panel, cladding system (steel, titanium, zinc)	●	●	—	
Stone natural, units	●	●	●	
F Stucco cement-based, min. 2-layer hard coat	●	●	●	
Vinyl & PVC Siding minimum .040 in. thick	—	—	●	
G Wood or Composite Wood painted, stained, charred, or treated lap siding, shingles, board & batten, rainscreen	●	●	●	Composite Only

2. Permit only composite wood on General and Row Buildings

Staff is proposing to permit only composite wood as an allowed major façade material on general and row buildings, maintaining the current standard of wood and composite for yard buildings.

3. Permit simulated or similar materials with a Minor Exception

Staff is proposing a Minor Exception for simulated versions of approved materials and materials similar to approved materials. Potential language is below with the underlined sections added to the existing Code:

110-9.5.3.c. *Other materials*. A design exception may be approved for materials not listed as permitted major materials, [...]. Samples and examples of successful high-quality local installation and the manufacturer's warranty and industry ratings must be provided by the applicant. A Minor Exception may be approved for simulated or similar materials to approved materials, provided they are at least as durable.

4. Remove percentage caps for Minor Materials, continuing the 70% Major Materials and other façade variety requirements

Because of the 70% Major Material requirement and the relatively high maximum amount of Minor Materials allowed, Staff is proposing eliminating the separate “maximum amount allowed on street façade” requirement for Minor Materials. Staff believes this section may be duplicative. There are additional façade variety requirements in the Code as well.

TABLE 9-5.B. ALLOWED MINOR FACADE MATERIALS

All allowed major facade materials may be used for minor facade materials, unless otherwise listed as prohibited in [Table 9-5.D](#).

MINOR FACADE MATERIAL (alphabetical)	BUILDING TYPES	LIMITATIONS	MAXIMUM AMOUNT ON ALLOWED STREET FACADES
Concrete Surfaces finished, stained, painted, treated	General, Civic	Below ground floor only	20%
Concrete Masonry Units minimum 3" depth, split-faced, burnished/ground face, glazed, or honed	General, Row, Civic	Below ground floor only	20%
C Fiber Cement Board finished panels	All	On all except Yard buildings, an allowed major material is required at grade up to 2 feet and within 3 feet of entrances	40%
E Metal Architectural architectural panel, cladding system (steel, titanium, zinc)	All	On all except Yard buildings, an allowed major material is required at grade up to 2 feet and within 3 feet of entrances	30%
Metal, Aluminum Composite (ACM) aluminum composite materials (ACM) or panels (ACP)	General, Row, Civic	Only 3rd or higher stories all facades	10%
F Stucco synthetic or with elastomeric finishes	All	Only 3rd or higher stories all facades	30%
Terra Cotta or Ceramic tiles or panels	All	All	20%
G Wood painted, stained, treated, natural, or aged lap siding, shingles, board & batten	All	All	20%
H Wood, Composite lap siding, shingles, board & batten, rainscreen system	All	All	30%

5. Applicants may request a Minor Exception for lower percentages of Major Materials on facades with limited public visibility.

Potential language is below with the underlined sections added to the existing Code:

9.5.3. *Major façade materials*. A minimum of 70 percent of each façade surface, not including window and door areas, must be composed of major façade materials per Table 9-5.A. A minor design exception may be approved for less than 70 percent major materials on facades or portions of facades with no or limited visibility from any street, civic space, or the rail corridor.

6. Consider a Minor Exception for wider segments under 9.5.12.2 building façade variety for buildings along Major Streets (as defined in the Code).

The Code requires building façade variety to increase interest, improve the pedestrian experience, and create better design. However, the code maintains the same requirement for

pedestrianized areas, like Devon, and non-pedestrian areas, like Lake St. The Code requires larger setbacks along Major Streets (such as Lake St. and County Farm Rd), recognizing that a different scale may be needed in a different environment. However, the same façade variety requirements apply. The Code already notes that,

A design exception may be approved for a façade design that does not meet regulations of this subsection if the applicant demonstrates that the proposed design achieves the intent of the building articulation regulations without meeting the building façade variety regulations.

Refer to 9.7.6.

Staff is requesting feedback on whether it would be acceptable to permit this as a Minor Exception for facades along Major Streets, where larger buildings may be consistent with the existing character.

Next Steps

No formal action is to be taken during this meeting. Staff will present the existing regulations and requests associated with each potential amendment at that time. Based on the Commission's feedback, Staff may come back with a formal Text Amendment request.



Hanover Park ^{USA}

AGENDA MEMORANDUM

TO: Chairman Serauskas and Development Commissioners

FROM: Shubhra Govind, Director of Community & Economic Development
Alex Schwartz, Village Planner

SUBJECT: Re-discussion of a recommended approval of a Text Amendment to Permit Some Level 3 EV Charging Stations as Permitted Accessory Uses

ACTION

REQUESTED: ☐ Approval ☐ Disapproval ☒ Discussion/Information

MEETING DATE: April 9, 2026

Request Summary

The following is scheduled for a re-discussion at the Development Commission meeting at 7:00 p.m. on April 9, 2026, in Room 214 of the Municipal Building, 2121 Lake St.:

Re-discussion of the recommended Zoning Code text amendment verbiage following the January 8, 2026 Public Hearing, pertaining to electric vehicle charging, including revisions to Section 110-6.6.2, *Accessory Uses and Structures in Nonresidential Districts*, to establish criteria for allowing certain Level 3 EV charging stations as permitted accessory uses.

Background

Following discussions on August 14 and November 13, 2025, regarding level 3 electric vehicle (EV) charging stations, the Development Commission held a Public Hearing on January 8, 2026, regarding permitting some Level 3 EV Charging Stations “by right” with criteria.

All present Development Commission members unanimously recommended approval to the Village Board, as follows:

- Sec. 110-6.6 – Accessory uses and structures.
 - o 6.6.2. Allowable accessory uses and structures in nonresidential districts.
 - w. Level 3 electric vehicle charging stations, as accessory special uses. **Installations meeting any of the following criteria shall not require special use approval but shall be subject to site plan and landscaping plan review:**
 1. **Installations serving four or fewer vehicles; or**
 2. **Installations on parking spaces in surplus of Code minimum requirements.**

During their February 5th meeting, the Village Board directed the matter back to the Development Commission to further discuss the potential impacts of installation of EV charging stations (on small or nonconforming parking lots).

Staff contacted several EV charging providers, including two most recently approved EV charging projects in Hanover Park (IONNA and Universal Green Group). Staff requested additional information regarding: Site suitability criteria and preferred location characteristics; feasibility of installation within smaller parking lots; construction costs; and any minimum parking space requirements for Level 3 charging installations.

The feedback indicated that EV Charging companies prioritize sites near highways or major roads, with high visibility and access. While most charging happens at home, public chargers are used during trips, making large, high-traffic lots more viable than small parking areas. With each installation costing \$200,000+, companies base location decisions on projected usage and revenue potential.

The Village Attorney proposed the following verbiage:

- Sec. 110-6.6 – Accessory uses and structures.
 - o 6.6.2. Allowable accessory uses and structures in nonresidential districts.
 - w. Level 3 electric vehicle charging stations, as accessory special uses; **Provided, subject to site plan and landscaping plan review, as to off-street parking spaces or facilities required to serve buildings or uses that comply with 6.6.2 and 6.6.3 of this Chapter, no special use is required for:**
 - (i) **installations serving four or fewer electrical vehicles when such installations result with at least an equal number of parking spaces available for non-electric vehicles or**
 - (ii) **installations serving vehicles on code compliant spaces in excess of the Code's legally conforming required parking spaces.**

Discussion Questions

- Should any adjustments be made to the text amendment verbiage that was recommended for approval on January 8, 2026:
 - a. Should the language be revised to emphasize that when 4 or fewer vehicles are served by right, there must be an equal number of parking spaces available for non-electric vehicles?
 - b. Are there any additional concerns or clarifications the Commission would like to propose?
 - c. Should the revised language be recommended for approval in place of the previously recommended language?

Next Steps

Staff will provide the Village Attorney with an updated version of the proposed text amendment reflecting the Development Commission's discussion and any requested revisions.

If no changes are recommended, staff will notify the Village Attorney and proceed with forwarding the recommended approval to the Village Board for consideration.