

VILLAGE OF HOMEWOOD



MEETING MINUTES

DATE OF MEETING: **September 3, 2026**

Appearance Commission

6:00 pm

Village Hall Board Room
2020 Chestnut Street
Homewood, IL 60430

CALL TO ORDER:

Chair Hrymak called the meeting to order at 6:11 pm.

ROLL CALL:

Members Scheffke, Quirke, Kluck, and Chair Hrymak were present.

In attendance from Village staff were Noah Schumerth Interim Director of Economic and Community Development and Darlene Leonard, Building Department Administrative Secretary. There was 1 member of the public in attendance, there was no one of the public attending virtually.

AYES: 4 (Members Scheffke, Quirke, Kluck, & Chair Hrymak)

NAYS: 0

ABSTENTIONS: 0

ABSENT: 3 (Members Banks, Preston, & Gonser)

APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES:

Chair Hrymak stated the minutes will be pushed to the next meeting as there is no quorum.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

Chair Hrymak asked if there was anyone attending online that had any comments.

There was no one online and therefore no public comments.

REGULAR BUSINESS:

26-58: Appearance Review for proposed new development at 1313-1351 175th Street:

Chair Hrymak introduced the case.

Director Schumerth gave an introduction of the project. The business is looking to relocate from its current location in Crestwood. The case was originally seen in October 2024. Schumerth stated that the Appearance Review needs to be renewed. Schumerth stated that there are some site design modifications and the case is considered a new development application.

Schumerth stated that the previous approval is not binding, and the decision needs to be made as if its details have never been seen before. The Planning and Zoning Commission recommended approval on

August 27 and the conditions include approval by the Appearance Commission. Schumerth stated that they are asking for a change to allow more of the Tier 2 materials than allowed by the Zoning Ordinance, and to have corrugated metal siding which is otherwise prohibited by zoning requirements. Schumerth stated that the Planning and Zoning Commission recommends approval providing the Appearance Commission approves the requested materials. Schumerth noted that the applicant has provided a sample of the materials in question.

John LaRoy, the applicant and owner of Apparel Redefined, was introduced to the Commission.

Mr. LaRoy stated the main changes in the application were to the size of the building. Originally it was to be 210 feet x 220 feet. Now they are proposing it to be 210 feet x 170 feet, reducing it by approximately 8,000 square feet. Mr. LaRoy stated that the project would double in size and they could go up to 90,000 -93,000 square feet on the site once the expansion is completed.

Mr. LaRoy stated that the existing office building will be stained to match the color of the panels. The front of the building and the flat steel panels will be in a darker gray. The side panels and the rear will be the corrugated metal. The panel on the west side of the building is an expandable panel that can come down as the building expands. There will be a red strip at the window line of the building.

Chair Hrymak asked what the prohibited material is.

- **Director Schumerth stated it is the corrugated material.**

Chair Hrymak asked if the material is prohibited on all sides.

- **Director Schumerth stated it is on all sides, but the PUD can modify the requirements to allow it with approval of a modification.**

Mr. LaRoy stated that in the middle of the site, there will be a glass walkway constructed to connect the two buildings. The front of the main building will be 28 feet in height, and the rear will be 21 feet in height, sloping toward Izaak Walton Preserve. The west and south walls will have a berm and approximately half of the east wall after the walkway will be constructed from the requested corrugated material.

Member Scheffke asked what material the north (front) wall of the building would be constructed from.

- **Mr. LaRoy stated it will be the flat panel metal material.**

Member Scheffke asked Staff if the area is considered industrial and if the material is allowed in those areas.

- **Director Schumerth stated the area is zoned limited manufacturing, or light industrial, and there is no exception in the code for these areas.**

Member Scheffke asked which wall would be the dark gray color.

- **Mr. LaRoy stated the corrugated walls.**

Member Quirke asked if the west wall is corrugated and if that is the wall that would be removed for the expansion.

- **Mr. LaRoy stated that both are correct.**

Member Quirke asked the benefit of using the corrugated metal.

- **Mr. LaRoy stated the cost of precast or masonry materials is at least double that of the corrugated material.**

Member Quirke asked for additional explanation about the removal of the west wall for expansion.

- **Mr. LaRoy stated metal buildings are designed for expansion and the material will allow for flexibility.**

Member Scheffke stated if the west wall can be looked at as a temporary wall instead of a permanent wall.

- **Mr. LaRoy stated there are 9 buildings in Homewood with a permanent corrugated material.**

Member Quirke asked if there is a way to “hide” the west wall.

Member Kluck also asked if the material on the north wall can be used on the west wall.

- **Mr. LaRoy stated yes and no. Mr. LaRoy stated that the flat panel material can be used, but it would bend in the removal and couldn't be reused. When they have expanded to the maximum use of the lot they would put the flat panel material up on the western side of the building. Mr. LaRoy stated that because of the setback from the street, the corrugated walls would look solid from the street.**

Member Kluck asked what tier the flat panel material falls into.

- **Director Schumerth stated Tier 2 – which is allowed for a maximum of up to 50% on the front façade. The variance is to allow 100% on the front wall.**

Member Quirke asked if the area in the northwest corner is shipping.

- **Mr. LaRoy stated yes.**

Member Quirke asked if anything can be installed to hide the wall. Quirke said that a great job was done to hide the corrugated wall on the east side.

- **Director Schumerth stated, to clarify the question for the applicant, if there is any way to screen the western wall with something beyond just grass.**

Chair Hrymak stated he looked a building in Glenwood with the same material and it didn't look good especially what was visible to the public. And there is no firm guarantee of expansion of the facility.

- **Mr. LaRoy stated the intention is to expand. There are currently no plans to hide the corrugated material now. If there are excessive spoils from the construction they would create a berm on the west side close to the edge of the property.**

Chair Hrymak stated he is concerned because he doesn't want the corrugated material to be visible at all. Hrymak stated that he does not like the corrugated material on the west side and would have a hard time approving it as proposed.

Chair Hrymak asked if the variance is for 100% of the material in the front (the flat panel material)

- **Director Schumerth stated correct, the code allows up to 50%.**

Chair Hrymak stated he has no problem with that. Hrymak stated he could accept the corrugated material on the east side of the building. Hrymak stated he cannot see it going on the west side and is open to other ideas.

Member Quirke stated the material is on the MABAS building, and as it pertains to this case, it is an ugly building which is not a good example.

Member Scheffke asked Staff if plantings can be done on a berm to hide more of the building.

- **Director Schumerth stated it is an option. The cost of earth removal is very high right now. Schumerth shared that there is a low berm to the east of the property. The Village looked into getting it removed and it was over \$300,000. Schumerth said there is caution for the Village to not require undue costs to the applicant relative to the benefit of the screening.**
- **Mr. LaRoy stated the dirt would go to the western edge of the property after the expansion.**

Chair Hrymak asked for the ballpark cost of the flat vs. the corrugated metal materials.

- **Mr. LaRoy stated about \$100,000 for this building, but it's not reusable so costs would increase with an expansion.**
- **Director Schumerth stated that the Appearance Commission does not have to come up with a solution for the applicant. Schumerth stated that the Commission could continue it and have the applicant come back with solutions.**

Member Scheffke stated the intent was to describe the need to use the corrugated panels.

Chair Hrymak stated he would like to see some sort of alternative to the current design. He doesn't think it would be approved if it is voted on today. Hrymak said he accepts the east, north, and south walls and would like to see alternatives for the west wall.

Member Kluck asked the projected timeframe for the addition.

- **Mr. LaRoy stated 2029. They wouldn't be in the building until Quarter 1 of 2027.**

Chair Hrymak called for a 5 minute recess at 6:44 pm

Chair Hrymak called back in session at 6:50 pm.

Chair Hrymak asked if the landscape plan is still going to the arborist.

- **Director Schumerth stated yes, he is still looking at it. There were some changes with the 2024 plans and they were addressed – such changes remain in the current plans as well. Any changes would be looked at with the final site plan.**

Chair Hrymak asked about lighting.

- **Director Schumerth stated the lighting standards are included and also will be looked at with the final site plan review.**

Chair Hrymak stated he doesn't want to cause any undue hardship and will approve the corrugate materials because of the expansion in 2029.

Member Quirke asked if the expansion would need to be reviewed.

- **Director Schumerth stated yes, it would be considered a new building area.**

Member Kluck asked if the flat panel would be used on the side after the expansion.

- **Mr. LaRoy stated yes.**

Chair Hrymak asked the color of the west side.

- **Mr. LaRoy stated it would be the darker gray.**

Director Schumerth asked the level of confidence for moving forward with the addition. And if the side panel would be reused.

- **Mr. LaRoy stated 80%. Reusing it is the intent. The addition wouldn't be less than 10,000 square feet. They could add up to 50,000 square feet. The thought is for 2 25,000 square foot additions. And then the final one would have the flat panel installed.**

Member Quirke asked for a review of the tiers for materials.

- **Director Schumerth stated in the design standards, Tier 1 is high quality & durability - brick, stone, and concrete. Tier 2 has maintenance required – siding, fiber cement board. Tier 3 is medium quality, more maintenance, but has cost savings – stucco, EFIS, architectural metal panels. Prohibited materials include unfinished concrete block and corrugated panels.**

Chair Hrymak asked why the materials are prohibited.

- **Director Schumerth stated metal buildings are restricted by code. Schumerth stated the new code pushed buildings to be more permanent structures with the use of permanent materials that have high durability and fewer maintenance or longevity issues. The thought is the corrugated panels are for short term use in building applications, which is why vinyl siding was included in the prohibited materials list as well.**
- **Mr. LaRoy stated he has been doing this for 20 years and this is the fourth time they have outgrown their space.**

A motion to approve Case 26-58 was made by Member Kluck, seconded by Member Scheffke

AYES: 4 (Members Scheffke, Kluck, Quirke, & Chair Hrymak)

NAYS: 0

ABSTENTIONS: 0

ABSENT: 3 (Members Banks, Preston, & Gonser)

Director Schumerth stated it will be at the meeting on the 10th and he will call him about it next week.

Case 26-55: Appearance review for pylon sign proposed at 17855 Halsted Street:

Chair Hrymak asked if the case should be moved to the October meeting.

- **Director Schumerth stated yes and it would need a motion to continue.**

A motion to continue Case 26-55 was made by Member Quirke; seconded by Member Kluck.

AYES: 3 (Members Kluck, Quirke, & Chair Hrymak)

NAYES: 1 (member Scheffke)

ABSTENTIONS: 0

ABSENT: 3 (Members Banks, Preston, & Gonser)

- **Director Schumerth stated they can continue the case of table it as the applicant needs to be present.**

Member Scheffke asked for an explanation.

- **Director Schumerth stated the applicant needs to be present for any questions.**

Member Scheffke asked is that is code or practice.

- **Director Schumerth stated he is not sure, but it is his understanding that it is part of the Village Code. He can keep searching, but there is nothing the Appearance Commission Code that mentions the applicant must be present. It has been long standing policy to have the applicant at the meeting. They are required to be present for public hearings with legal notice and testimony.**

Member Scheffke asked if it can be looked into.

- **Director Schumerth stated yes.**

Chair Hrymak stated it will be continued to the next meeting.

AYES: 4 (Members Scheffke, Quirke, Kluck, & Chair Hrymak)

NAYES: 0

ABSTENTIONS: 0

ABSENT: 3 (Members Banks, Preston, & Gonser)

OLD BUSINESS:

None

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

None

NEW BUSINESS

Director Schumerth stated there are numerous projects coming in the next few weeks including submittals for the Village Hall parking lot project.

Member Scheffke asked if that is what the utility markings are for.

- **Director Schumerth stated no. The markings are for crosswalks that are being installed at numerous downtown intersections The Village received a grant for crosswalks. This is Phase 1 of 3 of the Village's crosswalk program. Phase 2 with be at Dixie & Ridge and Phase 3 will be in the southwest part of the downtown.**

Member Scheffke asked the status of the car wash.

- **Director Schumerth stated they are still working on the special use submittals for the Planning and Zoning Commission.**

Director Schumerth stated on October 22 at 6:30pm there is commission training with the Planning & Zoning Commission which may include others in the region and the Appearance Commission is invited to attend.

Member Scheffke asked if the Mexican restaurant is still happening.

- **Director Schumerth stated they are currently in default with an agreement with the Village.**

ADJOURN:

A motion was made to adjourn the meeting by Member Kluck; seconded by Member Quirke.

AYES: 4 (Members Scheffke, Kluck, Quirke, & Chair Hrymak)

NAYS: 0

ABSTENTIONS: 0

ABSENT: 3 (Members Banks, Preston, & Gonser)

The meeting adjourned at 7:15pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Darlene Leonard

Darlene Leonard

Administrative Secretary