

**PLAN COMMISSION  
STUDY SESSION NOTES  
FEBRUARY 2, 2026**

**I. CALL TO ORDER**

The Plan Commission Study Session was called to order at 6:15 P.M. by President Tom Anderson at the Schererville Town Hall, 10 E. Joliet St.

**A. Pledge of Allegiance**

President Anderson stated that the Pledge of Allegiance was already recited at the Plan Commission Public Meeting.

**B. Roll Call**

President Tom Anderson said that Roll Call would stand from the Plan Commission Public Meeting. In the audience for the Study Session was Councilman Tom Schmitt.

**II. COMMISSION BUSINESS**

**A. R & J Construction/Premier Window Systems**

General Location: 6520 W. Lincoln Hwy. & 6430 W. Lincoln Hwy.

Petitioner(s): R & J Construction/Premier Window Systems – Ronald & Joanne Lewis

Represented by: DVG Team, Inc. – Engineer, Doug Rettig

Request: Primary Approval of a 2-Lot (C-3) Subdivision and U.S. 30 Commercial Corridor Overlay District Development Plan Review

Mr. Doug Rettig from DVG informed the board that in the audience were the petitioners Ronald and Joanne Lewis. Mr. Rettig stated that they were looking to subdivide two parcels of land to create a 2-Lot subdivision to be called Premier Addition. Mr. Rettig continued to say they currently have an operating business in the existing building that would remain as-is; but the lot line that runs north south would be moved slightly. Mr. Rettig added that the existing building would stay on Lot 1 and Lot 2 would remain vacant until it is sold for a future development. Mr. Rettig said that the surveys have been completed and showed that the wetlands have been delineated. Mr. Rettig informed the board that one of the topics they wished to discuss is if the Plan Commission would consider giving a waiver for Storm Water Detention to make Lot 2 more buildable. Mr. Rettig went on to say that Lot 1 would require a waiver because it had already been built and the ground behind the existing buildings are quite low; therefore, could not get the water to a proposed detention basin on Lot 2. Mr. Rettig added that if they were to receive waivers on both lots it would make Lot 2 larger and more buildable. Mr. Rettig stated that there is a lot of slope on Lot 2 which made everything fall to the wetlands in the back; so there is a challenge of not only the drainage but also the sanitary sewer because there is none nearby. Mr. Rettig added that there is a sanitary sewer to the north at the end of the cul-de-sac on Taylor St., and a 10' easement along the west side of Lot 11 in Woodland Pines Subdivision. Mr. Rettig then said that technically there was access from their property through an existing easement to that manhole but would need a pump. Mr. Rettig stated that the existing building was on a septic system but the new building would not be. Mr. Rettig continued to say that if they were to put in a sanitary sewer and ejector pit it would take care of the other building at the same time. Mr. Rettig added that they would have easy access to water because there is a water main directly across the front of the property. Mr. Rettig reiterated that they are challenged on sanitary but not insurmountable, and may need a partial or complete waiver on storm water detention.

Mr. Rettig stated that they would be back next month for primary approval and were not looking for site plan approval for either side at the moment; and just want to get the subdivision approved. Mr. Rettig said that the only development for Lot 1 would be to build a detached garage located behind the existing building for storage purposes. Mr. Rettig went on to say that because Lot 2 would be sold it is unknown what would be located there; therefore, it is unclear how big the detention pond would need to be. Mr. Rettig added that they would need

to go conservatively assuming most of it would be impervious, but the detention could be worked out at the site plan approval stage.

Mr. Anderson questioned if the utilities were coming from the north. Mr. Rettig responded that the sanitary is from the north, water from the front, and everything has to drain to the existing wetlands. Mr. Anderson asked if there would be a utility easement between the properties. Mr. Rettig replied that Lot 11 is located to the north of the property and is a platted lot. Mr. Rettig went on to say that the entire east side of that lot goes right up to the property line and has a 10' easement that runs north south all the way up through the Taylor St. cul-de-sac. Mr. Rettig added that they would directional bore underneath that ditch with a sanitary sewer force mains to get to that manhole. Mr. Rettig reiterated that the easement was already in place and had been platted with the Woodland Pines Subdivision. Mr. Anderson then asked if there would be a cross access easement between the two lots. Mr. Rettig replied that there was currently an ingress/egress easement that goes all the way across the front of the properties; therefore, the two properties could be interconnected with an easement. Mr. Jarvis stated that it looked as though the building encroached the building line; then asked if that would require a waiver or if it would go before the Board of Zoning Appeals. Mr. Rettig responded that it was an existing building. Mr. Jarvis stated that it would be a legal non-conforming use. Mr. Rettig said that they had been asked to plat a 50' building line but the existing building encroaches on that; adding that they could just not plat the building line for that lot. Mr. Jarvis replied that they needed to have that building line. Mr. Jarvis suggested not to force it into a legal non-conforming use with the building in case there is ever any bank issues or something like that. Mr. Rettig responded that they would not want that, but the building line is part of the Town Ordinance so it could probably be worked out at this stage. Mr. Rettig added they could plat a 30' building line for Lot 1 and give Lot 2 the 50' building line as per the ordinance. Mr. Anderson asked where they were planning to put the garage. Mr. Rettig replied the intent is to put it behind the parking area next to the existing building. Mr. Anderson questioned if the garage would be affected by the building line. Mr. Rettig replied that it would be behind the building line.

Mr. Jarvis asked what the conservation easement that runs through was for. Mr. Rettig replied that was because of the delineated wetlands. Mr. Rettig informed the board that a Wetland Consultant had gone to the property and delineated all the wetlands; adding that the wetlands would be left untouched and they would be plating the easement to preserve them. Mr. Jarvis then asked if there was a reason why they could not drain into the current drainage way that is located to the west of Lot 1. Mr. Rettig replied that currently all the land gently rolls and ends up in that huge area but the ordinance calls for storm water detention. Mr. Rettig continued to say that either a waiver would be necessary or they would need to provide the detention; and in his opinion, a waiver would make more sense because the wetland area is very long and already served as a detention of sorts. Mr. Jarvis stated that would be fine as long as the water is projected to go into the drainage way. Mr. Rettig added that they could do a filter strip; they could look at the storm water quality, slow it down, and filter before it is released. Mr. Rettig reiterated that they are not changing the existing site because there is not much that they could do there; Lot 2 would need some fill to level out before a building is built. Mr. Rettig then added that they could even put in a water quality feature or detention basin just south of the wetland limits. Mr. Jarvis stated that Lot 1 was currently draining that way anyway. Mr. Rettig went on to say that a waiver for Lot 1 is justifiable because it had been there forever and to add a little garage would not be a significant difference. Mr. Rettig continued that if someone were to put up a large project on Lot 2 with a lot of asphalt and roof, that would technically impact drainage; if it were to be something like a coffee shop with a smaller footprint it wouldn't be significant. Mr. Rettig informed the board that he would hate to design for the worst case scenario and it to not happen, because then he would have to plat an easement that would encumber the property and reduce the buildable area. Mr. Rettig said that in his opinion it would be ok to request a waiver for storm water detention for Lot 1, and then the storm water detention for Lot 2 could be worked out at the site plan stage.

Mr. Rettig stated that the main intent is to get the plat of record so they could get a permit to build a garage; adding that they would like to get through primary plat approval because they were not seeking permission on Lot 2 until site plan approval. Mr. Gorman asked where the easement from the cul-de-sac would be going for the sanitary sewer. Mr. Rettig stated that he had submitted the drawing before the easement was on there and that it's located right along the property line; and that he would be sure to have it shown before the next meeting. Mr. Rettig then mentioned that at site plan approval they would bring in the plans to redevelop a monument sign to replace where the existing sign is located. Mr. Anderson asked if they would be back before them in March. Mr. Rettig replied that they would.

## B. Case Addition

General Location: 935 Hwy. 330

Petitioner(s): Donna Case and Jeff Fryzel

Represented by: DVG Team, Inc. – Engineer, Doug Rettig

Request: 3-4 Lot (R-1) Residential Subdivision

Mr. Doug Rettig from DVG stated that in the audience were petitioners Mrs. Donna Case and Mr. Jeff Fryzel. Mr. Rettig stated that on the screen it showed the current parcel with Mrs. Case home outlined in red; adding that it is a large parcel that extends south quite a way. Mr. Rettig went on to say that Lot 1 showed the existing home, Lot 2 is located at the dead end of 69<sup>th</sup> Place, Lot 3 to the south, and Lot 4 to the south of that. Mr. Rettig continued that each lot would be 80' wide which was the minimum width allowed in R-1 Zoning. Mr. Rettig informed the board that 69<sup>th</sup> Pl. dead ends right at her property; and that there was also a platted 30' right-of-way for 69<sup>th</sup> Pl. next to her property, which is owned by the Town of Schererville. Mr. Rettig stated that they would like to take advantage of that fact and discuss how to meet the requirements for lot frontage. Mr. Rettig went on to say that every lot has to have 80' of frontage in an R-1 Zoning and to create those lots they would need frontage. Mr. Rettig said that they should terminate 69<sup>th</sup> Pl because they do not have the room for a conventional full sized cul-de-sac; typically they would need to plat a 60' radius or 120' diameter which would be too much for that area. Mr. Rettig asked if the Town would consider a hammerhead turnaround or some other kind of unconventional cul-de-sac, where they could still turn around a vehicle such as a snow plow or garbage truck; because those are the ones that have the bigger issues with dead ends. Mr. Rettig then asked Mrs. Case if the garbage trucks currently back down 69<sup>th</sup> Pl. Mrs. Case replied that she believed so. Mr. Rettig informed the board that they wished to work with the Town and come up with a cost effective way to terminate 69<sup>th</sup> Pl whether it be an abbreviated cul-de-sac or a smaller cul-de-sac. Mr. Rettig continued to say that he had done hammerhead turn arounds before and would like to receive feedback if the Town would entertain something like that; adding that if they had to dedicate a little more right-of-way they would. Mr. Rettig said that the lots would be about 187.5' deep but would only need 125' so there was space to dedicate, but they did not have the 120' to do a full-sized cul-de-sac. Mr. Rettig went on to say that technically Lot 2 and Lot 3 have frontage on a public right-of-way but that Lot 4 was a different story; wondering if they could put in a private driveway that the lots could all share in a public right-of-way. Mr. Rettig continued on that they could ask for waivers on lot frontage if they need to because Lot 4 only has 30' of frontage on that public right-of-way. Mr. Rettig added that they could even put in a pseudo-public private road in that right-of-way.

Mr. Anderson asked how wide the current right-of-way was. Mr. Rettig replied 30' wide. Mr. Anderson asked Mr. Rak what his recommendation would be because he works for Public Works and drives a snow plow. Mr. Rak responded that currently 69<sup>th</sup> Pl. is a pain to go up and down with a plow truck because they have to maneuver around all the cars, and with the larger trucks back all the way out. Mr. Rak went on to say that the leaf machine and chipper trucks would be the most concerning; as it is now they have to pull straight in, back out, turn around, back in, and then pull out to service both sides of the road. Mr. Rak added that the hammerhead turnaround would not work either. Mr. Rak stated that although they do not much care for the cul-de-sac but that would probably be the best answer. Mr. Rak then said that the cul-de-sac would be the easiest way because with the equipment it would be a pain no matter what. Mr. Rettig responded that he believed everyone agreed that if they were to put lots there they would need to do something; it does not work the way it is currently and with adding more lots it would make it worse. Mr. Rettig asked if the Town would consider a smaller than the typical cul-de-sac and that he would defer. Mr. Rettig said that the standard cul-de-sac was too large, suggesting to have a leaf truck drive around in a circle to measure how big of a circle would be needed; and then make the curbs to accommodate that. Mr. Rak stated that a cul-de-sac would be easier to have but people would still be parking in the street; if it would be made smaller than usual, people would still park in the street and that wouldn't help either. Mr. Rettig said that it was a tricky situation and if the Town is going to say we have to do a full sized cul-de-sac we could draw that out; and it would probably stop the entire project because it would be too costly and may not work. Mr. Rettig then stated that he could not commit to do a full size cul-de-sac without further discussion and further drawings. Mr. Jarvis asked if the easement being discussed was located on the west side of the line shown that the Town of Schererville owns. Mr. Rettig replied that was correct. Mr. Jarvis suggested to do an almost half cul-de-sac that takes in the right-of-way; they would need to measure what would be needed, and have No Parking signs that are strongly enforced. Mr. Rettig said that this would

be a great location in a beautiful area; and that he believed adding more lots would be great for the community.

Mr. Rettig informed the board that he was before them to see what would be the most desirable; adding that it would be great to get a more realistic radius of what they would need to turn a vehicle around with a trailer attached. Mr. Rettig went on to say that a typical cul-de-sac would be 90' from the back of curb to back of curb; and that if they could get it on a 50 foot they could make it work. Mr. Rettig added that they would not be able to make the lots work with a 90' curb and a 120' right-of-way. Mr. Jarvis believed that the measurements would be most important. Mr. Rettig agreed. Mr. Immig asked Mr. Rak if the primary concern was leaf pickup. Mr. Rak replied that it would be snow plowing, leaf season, and the chipper truck which run all the time. Mr. Rettig said that they could work with Public Works and send a survey crew out there and someone could literally just drive around in a circle; they could draw with chalk on the pavement and measure it to know what the number was and draw accordingly. Mr. Anderson stated that he understood that a full cul-de-sac would kill the project and would love to find a happy medium to make it work.

Mr. Jarvis asked what the parking lot west of the properties was. Mr. Rettig replied that was the Halls of St. George. Mr. Jarvis then asked if they had discussed with them about doing a cross access easement. Mr. Rettig replied that they consider that but was not where they wanted to go. Mr. Jarvis suggested to get with Public Works for a measurement. Mr. Rettig went on to say that sanitary was on the south side and water on the north side, and that the 6" mains were suitable for extending those lots. Mr. Rettig asked who they would need to work with at Public Works for that measurement. Mr. Rak replied to call Public Works Director, Chad Nondorf. Mr. Rettig stated that they would get that measurement and come up with a revised concept plan that would suffice for the turnaround. Mr. Anderson stated that seemed to be the only issue and that everything else looked good. Mr. Rettig verified that the board was not opposed to the project as long as there was a solution to the dead-end. Mr. Anderson stated that was correct and to get with Mr. Nondorf.

### **C. Gallas Development/Maintenance Building**

General Location: 350-370 E. U.S. Rte. 30 – Gallas 6<sup>th</sup> Addition, Lot 1

Petitioner(s): Brian Gallas

Request: U.S. 30 Commercial Corridor Overlay District Development Plan Review

Mr. Brian Gallas informed the board that he would like to build a maintenance building on his property to store equipment and keep the area clean. Mr. Anderson asked if the building would be located north of the Tyler Tenders building. Mr. Gallas replied that it would be directly in line with both that building and the adjacent property as well. Mr. Gallas went on to say that the only reason they did not build any further back was because the sewer, water lines, and electric runs between there. Mr. Anderson verified that it would be a 60' x 50' maintenance building to store the equipment that was currently parked on the property. Mr. Gallas confirmed and added that he went with a 60' wide building to line up and match the current building. Mr. Gallas went on to say that it would be a framed building so it would match the existing building and look nicer than a pole barn. Mr. Anderson said that there were landscaping requirements but because the area is all asphalt they could add some planters. Mr. Gallas responded that he did not have an issue and added planters to the drawing for greenspace; and that there was a lot of greenspace behind there as well. Mr. Jarvis asked how deep the lot was and questioned the area marked "seven parking spaces". Mr. Gallas replied that was the parking lot from the old Patrician, which had not been used since 2019. Mr. Anderson asked if he still had access around that property. Mr. Gallas replied that there was enough space for fire access to drive around; but could put the building a little further if necessary.

Mr. Gorman asked how far the garage from the north property line was. Mr. Gallas stated that it was approximately 200' from the back center building and then goes from there. Mr. Gorman stated that it would go across the property line. Mr. Gallas responded that it did not cross the property line and that maybe it would be more like 175'; and then repeated he would not have an issue with moving the building up more because there was plenty of room. Mr. Anderson stated that it would need to be away from the property line. Mr. Gorman stated that it appeared to be 175' and not 200'. Mr. Gallas asked if they built the building 125' from the front would it be good enough. Mr. Gorman stated that the shaded property area to the north was owned by the current owner of the old Patrician. Mr. Gallas stated that he still owned that property and that area was all wetlands. Mr. Gallas then repeated that he would move the building up

to keep it off that line. Mr. Anderson asked if it would be a 30' building line requirement. Ms. Sulek replied that it could be 30' because the property was in the Overlay District. Mr. Anderson verified that the building could go right up to the building line. Mr. Gorman stated that he could but would not suggest it. Ms. Sulek stated that they would still want trucks to be able to get around the building. Mr. Gallas said that he had no issue with leaving enough space and would just pull the building forward. Mr. Anderson stated to put the building where there would be enough room to get around it. Mr. Gallas repeated that he had no issue.

**III. CORRESPONDENCE**

There was no correspondence.

**IV. ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 6:55 P.M.