



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, April 9, 2026
7:00 pm

MINUTES

1. CALL TO ORDER: ROLL CALL

Chair Serauskas called the meeting to order at 7:01 pm

PRESENT: Commissioners: Ray Alvarez, Tom Clark, Vice Chair Watkins, Chair Serauskas

ABSENT: Commissioners: Chris Bjorkman, Theresa Palazzo

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 Clark, seconded by Commissioner Alvarez to approve the Minutes of March 12, 2026.

Voice Vote: All Ayes.

Motion passes.

6. TOWN HALL SESSION: none

7. NEW BUSINESS:

7-a. Discussion on Future Zoning Code Amendments – Village Center Façade Requirements

Planner Schwartz reviewed the prior discussion the Commission had at the March 12th meeting regarding:

- Use of wood on general buildings
- Use of fiber cement board on general buildings – may have better durability
- Use of simulated materials
- Non-street facing facades may have a lower standard of materials
- Percentages of Minor Façade Materials

He noted that staff's recommendations centered around wood and simulated wood, with the Commission's main issue being durability over the years, not the look of it.

Planner Schwartz then asked the Commission 5 questions relating to those topics:

1. Should fiber cement board be permitted as a Major Material? *The Commission agreed it should be permitted.*
2. Should only composite be allowed on General and Row buildings? *The Commission agreed that for general buildings composite was acceptable, and for row and yard buildings composite + wood was acceptable.*
3. Should we permit simulated or similar materials with a Minor Exception? *The Commission agreed as long as the similar materials are equally as durable.*
4. Should we remove percentage caps for Minor Materials? *The Commission agreed to change the "Maximum Amount on Allowed Street Facades" to equal to or lesser than 30% (while the 70% Major Material requirement remains).*
5. Should we allow a Minor Exception for lower percentages of Major Materials on facades with limited visibility from the street? *The Commission agreed.*

Planner Schwartz then began the topic of **Building Façade Variety**, with the goal to be to allow more flexibility for buildings on major streets since the building would be setback 30 feet, and the public would only see the front and would also be driving past at 40mph or more.

Currently the Code requires each street façade to be varied in segments less than or equal to 90 feet; each segment must have a different dominant material OR by color, scale, or orientation of that material. A design exception may be requested.

The example Planner Schwartz cited the Suburban Tire Center on Lake Street as an example, which is 95 feet on one side. With the scale of Lake Street, it looks acceptable. The proposed daycare will have a section that is 110-foot in length with the same material (brick) but the windows will be recessed and will break up the monotony.

Planner Schwartz stated 3 considerations for the variety standards:

1. Deeper setbacks on major streets (Lake, Barrington, County Farm)
2. Existing developments
3. Speed of traffic

DISCUSSION QUESTIONS FOR COMMISSIONERS

1. Do the façade variety standards need to be the same on Devon Avenue as on Lake Street?
2. Would a Minor Exception be acceptable on "major streets?"

Commission Clark asked if we leave things as is, and a developer has to come before the Commission for Minor Exceptions, would it be discouraging for a potential developer? We don't want to create unnecessary "red tape" that would make developers not want to work with Hanover Park.

Director Govind said for major projects, a developer should definitely come before the Commission. Staff will always negotiate for better designs and façade materials. For minor things, staff can approve without the developer needing to come before the Commission. The whole idea for the Village Center Code was so that staff would not have to negotiate good design regarding materials and longevity.

Chair Serauskas said if there are just 2 or 3 minor exceptions, it is fine for staff to approve. He said however, if there are many minor exceptions requested, we have to be realistic about what we allow a developer to change with what we require.

Planner Schwartz said staff will draft a formal recommendation for the Board.

7-b. Re-discussion of a Recommended Approval of a Text Amendment to Permit Some Level 3 EV Charging Stations as Permitted Accessory Uses

Chair Serauskas stated the Commission has previously discussed this issue, but the Board has asked them to re-discuss due to the language in the proposed new Code not specifying small parking lots and non-conforming parking lots.

Director Govind said Attorney Paul wanted the language regarding the number of EV parking spaces to say that there must be an equal number of spaces made available for gas vehicles. So, if there are 2 EV spaces, there must be at least 2 spaces available for gas vehicles.

Commission Clark commented that since it is private property, couldn't it be up to the property owner if they only wanted to have EV parking spaces? Director Govind said they could, but we are counting on common sense to prevail; if a property owner only has EV spaces available, she/he will lose business from customers who have gas vehicles, which are a majority of drivers/customers. He confirmed EV spaces cannot be used by gas vehicles per state law.

Commissioner Alvarez asked if the Code counts EV spaces toward the total number of spaces required. Director Govind said EV spaces do count toward the total number of spaces.

Planner Schwartz commented that in Hanover Park there is only one commercial parking lot that has less than 8 spaces - it is the little dental office building off Irving Park and Edgebrook, and it technically has only 6 spaces.

Commissioner Clark said we should not be telling a commercial property owner how to manage his property.

The Development Commission all agree with leaving the initial language the way it is unless legally necessary to make changes.

Trustee Albuck stated that the Commission's decision is what should be considered and brought before the Board.

8. DEVELOPMENT UPDATES

Director Govind commented that two things have occurred at the state level:

People Over Parking Act (POPA) states that for parcels within a ½ mile of a train station/Metra or public transportation hub, or within 1/8 mile of a bus route where buses come every 15 minutes, there cannot be any parking requirements for any development

projects. However, many future builders may still want to provide parking for residents or they will not be able to sell or rent their units.

The bill has not passed yet, but if it passes, would take effect June 1, 2026.

The Build Act aims to address the “missing middle” in housing. There is a lot of affordable housing, and a lot of expensive housing. The state wants to require more of the “middle” housing. One direct impact on Hanover Park would be a reduction in the minimum lot size for a R-2 single-family home to 2,500 square feet. Additionally, the lot would permit on a typical interior lot, which in Hanover Park is about 7500-7700 square feet, three homes vs just one home as now permitted. This could dramatically change the fabric and look of communities everywhere.

The Build Act also addresses Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs), requiring municipalities to permit them in all residential districts. ADUs include basement units, backyard units, and units above detached garages. Any single-family house could then have an ADU. The issue is whether each municipality should be allowed to decide what they want to allow rather than making it a state law.

Director Govind also informed the Commission that Tom Fortney is resigning from the Development Commission – he is moving out of Hanover Park. At the next Village Board meeting on April 16 there will be three additional appointments.

9. ADJOURNMENT

Motion by Vice Chair Watkins and seconded by Commissioner Clark to adjourn the meeting.

Voice Roll Call Vote: All Ayes.

Motion carried: Meeting adjourned at 8:02 pm

Transcribed by:



Kathy Sjoedin
Sr. Admin. Assistant
April 9, 2026



Chair Serauskas