

**MINUTES OF THE PLAN COMMISSION  
PUBLIC MEETING  
DECEMBER 1, 2025**

**I. CALL TO ORDER**

The Plan Commission Public Meeting was called to order at 6:00 P.M. by President Tom Anderson at the Schererville Town Hall, 10 E. Joliet St. Schererville, IN.

**A. Pledge of Allegiance**

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

**B. Roll Call**

Roll Call was taken with the following members present: President Tom Anderson, Secretary Gary Immig, Mr. Myles Long, Mr. Bob Kocon, Mr. Chris Rak, and Mr. Tom Kouros. Staff present: Town Manager James Gorman, Director of Operations Andrew Hansen, Planning & Building Administrator Denise Sulek, Recording Secretary Megan Schiltz, Attorney Christian Bartholomew, and Town Engineer Neil Simstad. In the audience was Councilman Tom Schmitt. Absent was Vice-President William Jarvis.

**C. Approve Minutes of the Plan Commission Public Meeting of November 3, 2025**

Mr. Kocon made a motion to approve which was seconded by Mr. Immig and carried 6-0.

**II. PUBLIC ACTION AND PUBLIC HEARINGS**

**A. P.C. Case #25-12-23 Anna Street Second Addition**

General Location: 143 W. Joliet St.

Petitioner(s): Town of Schererville, James M. Gorman – Town Manager

Request: Primary Approval of a 1-Lot (INST) Institutional Subdivision W/Waivers of Storm Drainage Control Ordinance No. 2009 Regulations:

Chapter Five, Paragraph G, Entitled: Drainage and Swales

- 6) A minimum of 20 feet along the swale (10 feet from each side of the centerline must be designated on the recorded plat as Drainage Easement. (Requesting none)

Chapter Six, Paragraph D, Entitled: General Detention Basin Design Requirements

- 13) A minimum of twenty (20) feet horizontally from the top of bank of the facility, or the 100-year pool if no defined top of bank is present, shall be dedicated as permanent storm water easement if the above-noted boundary of the common area does not extend that far: Within this easement area, no trees shall be planted within 50 feet of any pipe outlet entering the pond or the outlet for the pond.

In addition, an exclusive easement to assure access to the pond from an adjacent public street/right-of-way shall be required. No above-ground utilities or other obstruction that may hinder access shall be allowed within the exclusive access easement. Additional access easements may be required for larger ponds.

Mr. Anderson asked if Proofs of Publication were in order. Attorney Christian Bartholomew replied that they do have Proofs of Publication and that notices looked to be in order for the petition items as stated on the agenda, but Mr. James Gorman had some additional comments on that. Mr. Gorman stated that they had come across another section from the Stormwater Drainage Ordinance No. 2009 which includes Design Storm Frequencies with an item that had been omitted from the agenda before notices went out. Mr. Gorman went on to say that after discussing with Attorney Bartholomew, it would be considered an improper notice; therefore, we need to table this and resend notices to include the additional section.



Mr. Gorman then read for the record:

*Chapter Five, Paragraph A, Entitled: Design Storm Frequencies*

- 6) *A minimum of 25ft. from top of the bank on each side of a new channel shall be designated on the recorded plat as a Drainage Easement. No Landscaping is allowed within any Drainage Easement, except for a minimum 25-foot width of filter strip or suitable grass that shall be installed along the top of bank.*

Mr. Gorman added that he would also like to reiterate what had been said at the previous Study Session; we do meet all the detention requirements for the flow that is going to come onto that site, not only the on-site requirements of flow but the off-site flow as well. Mr. Gorman then said that on the advice of Attorney Bartholomew they were going to re-advertise to include Chapter Five, Paragraph A. Mr. Anderson asked if they were looking for a motion to continue this hearing or table it due to a missing agenda item. Mr. Gorman replied that they have had cases where the whole ordinance was a waiver, but since we advertised for specific sections, we would need to re-advertise. Mr. Rak made a motion to table P.C. Case #25-12-23. The motion was seconded by Mr. Long and carried 6-0. Mr. Anderson then asked Mr. Gorman if he would advertise for the January meeting. Mr. Gorman replied that they would be back in for the January 5<sup>th</sup> meeting.

### **III. COMMISSION BUSINESS**

- A. Review P.C. Case #24-12-7 First Federal Plaza Addition, Lot 2  
General Location: 1924 U.S. 41 (F/K/A: Amarillo Roadhouse)  
Petitioner(s): Tam & James Huynh  
Represented by: Sara E.F. Gensburg, LTD – Betsy Gensburg, Architect  
Request: Review proposed amendment to the U.S. 41 Commercial Corridor Overlay District Development Plan (Approved, December 2, 2024)

Mr. Gorman informed the board that this case was in front of the Plan Commission but they had changed the roof line from the approved original plan; they were building a different plan that had been submitted down State, but would still need to be reviewed by the board for approval. Architect Sara Gensburg, Owner Jimmy Bui, and General Contractor Mike Nguyen from D Reliable Contractor approached the podium. Mr. Anderson asked if the drawing on the projector screen was what had been submitted down State or what the commission had previously approved. Mrs. Gensburg replied the drawing is what was approved and had been submitted down State, but is not what was currently under construction. Mr. Kouros asked if there was a reason for the change or if it was just for aesthetics. Mrs. Gensburg replied that once they had completed the demolition and started developing the exterior construction, they found the existing roof lines that the general contractor is now following. Mr. Nguyen said that they were just adding on top of the current shape. Mr. Kouros asked if the side frame was strictly to follow the roof line. Mr. Nguyen replied that was correct. Mr. Anderson asked if they would have three peaks now. Mr. Nguyen replied that they wanted to add the 2x6 metal frames to make the top of the roof straight. Mr. Gorman informed the board that the drawings that were provided did not match what was being constructed; Town of Schererville Building Inspector Steve Winarski, had stopped the job because what they were constructing was not what had been submitted. Mr. Gorman went on to say that the columns that were on the ends are no longer there and that he had no idea what exactly the knee walls were for. Mr. Kouros asked what the knee walls were for. Mr. Nguyen replied to have them go straight up and across. Mr. Kouros then asked if it was just for looks or if it had an actual purpose. Mr. Nguyen replied that it was for looks. Mr. Anderson wanted to clarify that it would go across the front to make it one flat building. Mr. Nguyen responded that was correct. Mr. Gorman stated that previously the board did not want the box and that was why they asked for there to be peaks. Mr. Anderson stated that once something gets approved they could not change it; adding that he wants something to “break it up” and not have a box look. Mrs. Gensburg replied that it was flat when it was approved. Mr. Anderson asked what the question would be then. Mrs. Gensburg stated that they were proposing to put on gables. Mr. Gorman stated that what was on the screen was not a good copy but it showed that there were three peaks. Mr. Nguyen said that there was one in the middle and two on each side. Mr. Anderson questioned that there were peaks attached to it. Mr. Gorman responded that was correct. Mr. Anderson then asked if that would be for signage. Mr. Gorman replied most likely and added that he did not know where the water would go if there was a wall there. Mr. Anderson asked what would happen with the drainage if the walls go up. Mrs. Gensburg stated that there were scuppers on the back and the front. Mr. Nguyen stated that was correct.



Mr. Kouros asked if the intention is to continue the wall all the way around the building and to lose the peaks. Mr. Nguyen replied that they were keeping the peaks. Mrs. Gensburg stated that the peaks would be right in front of that which was very similar to what had been proposed. Mr. Anderson asked if the knee wall would then be behind the peaks. Mr. Nguyen replied that was correct and that you still see the peak but the top is straight and flat. Mr. Kouros said that he was also concerned about drainage. Mr. Immig wanted to verify that the knee walls are going around the building from north to south. Mr. Nguyen stated that was correct. Mr. Immig stated that it would be all the way around the entire building. Mr. Nguyen responded that it would just be on the front side. Mr. Immig asked if the knee walls would have siding. Mr. Nguyen replied that they would have Durock over plywood with a lightweight stucco. Mr. Immig said that the purpose would be decorative. Mr. Nguyen stated that was correct. Mr. Immig then said that the peaks in the front are structural. Mr. Nguyen responded that the peaks were existing from the previous building and that they were just adding to the top. Mr. Anderson stated that there would be a column on the north and a column on the south, with a straight wall across and that the peaks would stay there. Mr. Nguyen stated that was correct. Mr. Kocon asked if the wall would be going all the way across the building on the backside. Mr. Nguyen replied that it would at the pit only.

Mr. Immig questioned where the drainage would go. Mr. Nguyen responded that there were a total of nine downspouts; two on the north side, two on the south side, a large downspout in the middle of the building, and two more on each side in the back. Mr. Immig asked if the downspouts would go through the knee wall and if there would be a scupper. Mr. Nguyen replied that there were two scuppers on the right and two more on the left; the downspout in the middle of the building goes to the tendon and the two in the back go straight to the back. Mr. Immig then asked Mrs. Gensburg if she had designed all the knee walls. Mrs. Gensburg stated that she had designed the original plan and is now redesigning the plan because it was not built exactly as it had been originally drawn. Mrs. Gensburg added that everything was field measured and the plans will reflect the new design. Mr. Anderson asked if the Inspector stopped the job because it was not what had been submitted or because it was not up to code. Mr. Gorman replied that it had been stopped because it was not what had been submitted and that he did not understand how the drainage would happen. Mr. Anderson stated that it just looked like they were putting a wall behind the peaks. Mr. Gorman asked and Mr. Anderson confirmed that there would not be anything on the north or south side. Mr. Anderson asked if they would be required to get an amended State Release. Ms. Sulek replied that was correct. Mr. Anderson asked if it had been submitted to the State. Mrs. Gensburg replied that she was waiting on this evening's approval before submitting down State. Mr. Gorman asked if this would be the exact plans she would submit or if the Town would receive copies of what gets submitted to the State. Mrs. Gensburg replied that they could get copies of what is submitted; adding that the interior would not change, it would just be the exterior. Mr. Immig asked what would be the purpose of the knee wall going east to west if it was all decorative and not for structure. Mrs. Gensburg replied that is what the owner likes.

Mr. Kouros asked Attorney Bartholomew what would be the appropriate motion. Attorney Bartholomew replied that the board would be moving to approve the amended development plan as submitted. Mr. Kouros asked Ms. Sulek if staff would need to see more from the petitioner before the motion passes. Ms. Sulek replied no and that they would receive the amended set of plans that the Architect is filing down State; the Building Inspector will review those plans and then reapprove. Mr. Rak asked if the submittal to the State would be sufficient for the matter to pass. Mr. Gorman replied that was correct because the way it is going to be built will be ongoing with inspections; so the Inspector will be out making sure it meets all requirements in the meantime. Mr. Immig asked if it would be necessary to be subject to the State or if it would be a given that it would be subject to that. Mr. Gorman replied that typically the board would approve, just like with the original plans, and then the architect sends the drawings down State. Mr. Kouros made a motion to approve the amended development plan of P.C. Case #24-12-7 subject to all State, Local, and Federal Regulations. The motion was seconded by Mr. Rak and carried 6-0.

B. Findings of Facts:

1. P.C. Case #25-9-16 41° North Tavern  
General Location: 8101 Wicker Ave. – Eagle River Northwoods Addition  
Petitioner(s): Silken & Shivangi Patel  
Secondary Approval of a U.S. 41 Commercial Corridor Overlay District Development Plan  
APPROVED W/CONTINGENCIES (6-0) 11/3/25

Mr. Kocon made a motion to approve which was seconded by Mr. Rak and carried 6-0.



2. P.C. Case #25-9-17 Crossroads YMCA  
General Location: 221 U.S. Hwy. 41 – Omni 41 First Addition, Part of Ease 854.92 ft.  
of Lot 1  
Petitioner(s): Crossroads YMCA  
Represented by: DVG Team, Inc. – Russ Pozen, P.E.  
Secondary Approval of a U.S. 41 Commercial Corridor Overlay District  
Development Plan APPROVED W/CONTINGENCIES (6-0) 11/3/25

Mr. Rak made a motion to approve which was seconded by Mr. Long and carried 6-0.

3. P.C. Case #25-9-18 Fountain Park Subdivision Commercial (Proposed: Floor & Décor)  
General Location: 1516-1530 U.S. 41 – Fountain Park Subdivision, Lot 1 of the  
Resubdivision of Lot 5 and Part of Lot 8  
Petitioner(s): Floor & Décor – Caitlin Pipkin, Development Manager  
Represented by: Torrenga Engineering – Don Torrenga, P.E.  
Secondary Approval of a U.S. 41 Commercial Corridor Overlay District  
Development Plan APPROVED W/CONTINGENCIES (6-0) 11/3/25

Mr. Kocon made a motion to approve which was seconded by Mr. Long and carried 6-0.

4. P.C. Case #25-10-20 Appollo Group Addition, Lot 2  
General Location: 847-997 U.S. 41 – Appollo Group Addition, Lot 2  
Petitioner(s): Rich Rueth  
(Amended) Primary Approval of the U.S. 41 Commercial Corridor Overlay District  
Development Plan – Regarding underground utility work, retention pond, removal of  
fencing from the ditch, grading and landscaping  
APPROVED W/CONTINGENCIES (6-0) 11/3/25

Mr. Long made a motion to approve which was seconded by Mr. Rak and carried 6-0.

5. P.C. Case #25-11-21 143 W. Joliet St.  
General Location: 143 W. Joliet St.  
Petitioner(s): Town of Schererville – James M. Gorman, Town Manager  
Rezone from (R-2) Residential to (INST) Institutional Zoning District  
FAVORABLE RECOMMENDATION TO THE TOWN COUNCIL (6-0) 11/3/25

Mr. NAME made a motion to approve which was seconded by Mr. NAME and carried #

6. P.C. Case #25-11-22 0.370 Acre Parcel (Joliet St.)  
General Location: 0.370 Acre Parcel East of 149 Joliet St., South of Joliet St.  
Petitioner(s): Town of Schererville – James M. Gorman, Town Manager  
Rezone from (R-2) Residential to (INST) Institutional Zoning District  
FAVORABLE RECOMMENDATION TO THE TOWN COUNCIL (6-0) 11/3/25

Mr. Rak made a motion to approve which was seconded by Mr. Long and carried 6-0.

C. Correspondence

There was none.

IV. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 6:32 P.M.

Respectfully Submitted:

  
Gary Immig, Secretary