

**PLAN COMMISSION
STUDY SESSION NOTES
APRIL 21, 2025**

I. CALL TO ORDER

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

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, Vice-President William Jarvis, Mr. Myles Long, Mr. Robert Kocon, and Mr. Chris Rak. Staff present: Town Manager James Gorman, Director of Operations Andrew Hansen, Planning and Building Administrator Denise Sulek, and Recording Secretary Megan Schiltz. Absent were Secretary Gary Immig and Mr. Tom Kouros. In the audience were Councilmen Caleb Johnson and Tom Schmitt.

II. COMMISSION BUSINESS

**A. Fawn Plaza, Unit 1 & Replat of Fawn Plaza, Unit 2
(Proposed: Adlaka Commercial Addition)**

General Location: 7300-7310 W. Lincoln Hwy. – Fawn Plaza, Units 1 & 2

Petitioner(s): Sat Adlaka

Represented by: Torrenga Engineering & Surveying – Surveyor, John Stuart Allen

Request: 4 – Lot (C-3) Highway Commercial Subdivision and U.S. 30 Commercial
Corridor Overlay District Developmental Plan Review

Mr. John Stuart Allen represented the petitioner. Mr. Allen showed the plat of survey for this property with a legal description that was written to create three parcels; then stated that he wanted to divide them into four. Mr. Allen said that the intent is for an ambulatory service. Mr. Allen went on to say that they had created a one way in, one way out access onto and off of 75th Ave. Mr. Allen then stated that because this would be primarily for ambulances there will be signage so people who visit the establishment would not be allowed to enter or exit there. Mr. Anderson wanted to verify that it would be strictly for ambulances. Mr. Allen said that was correct. Mr. Anderson stated that his concern would be people using that as a cut through to get away from the intersection at Cline Ave. and U.S. 30. Mr. Allen responded that there would probably be employees of the ambulatory service that would be going in and out of there as well, but would put up signage to make sure that it was clear. Mr. Jarvis asked if Lot 4 would be where the ambulatory service would go. Mr. Allen said it would go where the existing building was on Lot 3. Mr. Allen continued to say that both Lot 1 and Lot 4 are vacant parcels for future developments. Mr. Allen stated that this would clean up the line between Lot 3 and Lot 4 to how the legal description should be. Mr. Anderson wanted to clarify that there would be signage stating that it was not a public right-of-way because it concerned him that people would just use it as a cut through. Mr. Rak added that was his concern as well. Mr. Anderson asked Ms. Sulek if there were any restrictions placed when the access easement was put there. Ms. Sulek replied that there was not. Mr. Allen said that he had put a no access easement across the entire northern line with the exception of those two openings. Mr. Anderson then asked if Lot 4 was going to be kept vacant. Mr. Allen responded that there were no plans for it at this point.

Mr. Anderson asked if there were any questions or comments from staff or board. There were none. Mr. Anderson questioned when they intended to get on the agenda. Mr. Allen replied at the next meeting. Mr. Anderson then asked if there was a ditch. Mr. Allen replied that there was a swale and that the detention was in the parking lot; when it rains there is a throttle in the catch basin at the northwest corner of the parking lots on Lot 4 and Lot 2. Mr. Allen went on

to say that there was a smaller pipe to restrict the amount of flow going out of that area. Mr. Anderson asked if the entire north end had a ditch or if it was on the other side of the street. Mr. Allen stated that there was a ditch along the north line in front of Lot 1 with a swale in the right-of-way; there is a large wetland to the west of Lot 1 which is the outfall. Mr. Allen continued to say that when Lot 1 is developed they would have to put in a detention pond to divert and that the utilities and structures with Lot 1 would have to be moved and reoriented. Mr. Gorman asked Mr. Anderson if he was asking if there would be a ditch line where the roads were going to be; and if they would need a culvert going under those entrances. Mr. Anderson said he was. Mr. Allen stated that edge of pavement was flat so when they go to put the pavement in they would have to put a culvert there. Mr. Allen said that he would make it clearly defined for preliminary and the site plan for the other two parcels would be addressed as well. Mr. Anderson stated that the question for engineering would be whether that would impede anything without a culvert there. There being no further questions, Mr. Anderson said to come back for the next meeting.

B. Nowak's Addition (Phil's Collision Center)

General Location: 1530 U.S. Hwy. 30

Petitioner(s): Edward Kalinowski

Represented by: Region Contractors, LLC – Architect, Nick Georgiou

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

Mr. Nick Georgiou from Region Contractors represented on behalf of Mr. Edward Kalinowski from Phil's Collision Center. Mr. Georgiou stated that the proposed project was part of a commercial multi-lot subdivision in Nowak's Addition Lot 1. Mr. Georgiou went on to say that the existing facility was a body shop office; with the proposed addition of a 3,200 sq. ft. open area body shop, located at the rear of the facility. Mr. Georgiou added that there was existing infrastructure throughout the property; there is also a cell tower with a lease access easement that goes all the way to the back of the property. Mr. Georgiou then said that there would not be any changes to the sign. Mr. Anderson asked if this would just be an expansion of the existing building. Mr. Georgiou responded that was correct and that it would be to the rear of the building and would not be visible from the front. Mr. Georgiou then added that there would be four overhead doors and two service doors. Mr. Jarvis asked what the total square feet would be because state permits may require the building to be sprinkled. Mr. Georgiou replied that the rear wall was a concrete firewall and that they are treating it as an addition with a separation; initially it was proposed to have a service door connection between the two and will verify that it was a fire rated door. Mr. Georgiou went on to say that the back wall was a firewall and would allow the 3,200 sq. ft. because it will be a post framed wood building; adding that the current structure is steel and masonry.

Mr. Carlos Ruiz from Region Contractors stated that the existing building had a paint booth which was sprinkled. Mr. Jarvis asked what the construction on the exterior would be. Mr. Georgiou reminded the board that it would only be an addition in the back; then replied that the new building would have both metal siding and roofing. Mr. Jarvis then asked if it was over 800 ft. in the back and would there be concrete and brick. Ms. Sulek stated that was a requirement unless waived. Mr. Gorman reminded the petitioner that they would need a dumpster enclosure as well. Mr. Georgiou asked if there were any more submittal requirements. Ms. Sulek replied that he would need to look at the overlay requirements. Mr. Anderson wanted to verify that the proposed building would not be visible from Route 30. Mr. Georgiou replied it would not be seen at all. Mr. Jarvis asked if the blacktop would extend all the way back. Mr. Georgiou responded that the blacktop was being discussed with the owner and needed to know if that was a direct criteria. Mr. Georgiou went on to say that currently the back of it is stoned where there is parking. Mr. Anderson stated that if there would be access to the overhead doors then it would need to be paved. Mr. Jarvis asked if they should require bollards by the doors. Mr. Ruiz asked if they could pave the west side of the building to the existing pavement and then do a ribbon running east to west; that way it would act like an apron to the two loading doors in the rear. Mr. Ruiz then asked if that would suffice as pavement. Mr. Anderson stated that the plans showed a single door to the north. Mr. Ruiz replied that the owner would like to put two doors on the rear which would be to the north and add two more doors to the west. Mr. Anderson responded that they would want paving and bollards. Mr. Hansen then pulled up a clear picture on google earth for everyone to see. Mr. Georgiou stated that the image showed the stone paving to the rear where the pavement is currently to the west. Mr. Anderson asked if there was a designated area for the dumpster enclosure. Mr. Georgiou replied that currently it is on the side of the building, but could put the dumpster to the back of

the rear of that existing one with the pavement running up to it. Mr. Anderson stated that he would be fine with a waiver for the siding because it would not be visible from the street. Mr. Anderson then said that they would need paving to the doors, a dumpster enclosure, and that they would need to check with the Fire Marshall to see if the building would need to be sprinkled. Mr. Long asked if the parking lots would be sufficient for the expansion and what would be done with all the vehicles currently in the back. Mr. Georgiou replied that those are staged vehicles for the operation and that the front parking was strictly used for customers; adding that the owner does stage rotating vehicles on the stone in the back. Mr. Anderson asked if there were any more questions or comments. There were none. Mr. Anderson asked what the timeline was. Mr. Georgiou replied that the owner wanted to go as quickly as possible but they were platted as a subdivision and would need to present a more detailed depicting of the proposal. Mr. Anderson said to get where the dumpster needed to be, paving figured out, and a waiver for the metal siding and roofing. Mr. Jarvis asked if they would need to relook at the drainage. Mr. Anderson then stated for the petitioner to turn in plans for engineering to review and come back before then board once everything is together.

III. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 6:23 P.M.