



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

Village Manager
Juliana A. Maller

VILLAGE OF HANOVER PARK DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION - REGULAR MEETING

2121 Lake Street, Hanover Park, IL
Municipal Building, Room 214

Thursday, January 8, 2026
7:00 pm

AGENDA

1. CALL TO ORDER: ROLL CALL
2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE
3. ACCEPTANCE OF AGENDA
4. PRESENTATIONS/REPORTS: None
5. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – November 13, 2025 (no meeting in December)
6. TOWNHALL SESSION: Persons wishing to address the public body must register prior to Call to Order. Public comment limited to 5 minutes per speaker.
7. NEW BUSINESS:
 - 7-a. Conduct a Public Hearing to consider amendments to Sec. 110-6.6.1 & 2 of the Village of Hanover Park Zoning Code to permit some Level 3 EV Charging Stations to be permitted Accessory Uses.
 - 7-b. Conduct a Public Hearing to consider amendments to the Village of Hanover Park Zoning Code, including: 1) Sec. 110-9.8.2.a. Minimum Primary Frontage Coverage, to clarify that driveways approved through a Minor Design Exception are exempted from primary frontage calculations; and Sec. 110-9.5.10., Balconies, to allow balconies with less than 50% of the perimeter abutting an exterior wall, separate columns or posts, and greater than 30% façade coverage..
8. DEVELOPMENT UPDATES
9. ADJOURNMENT



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

Village Manager
Juliana A. Maller

VILLAGE OF HANOVER PARK DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION – SPECIAL MEETING

Village Hall, Room 214
Hanover Park IL

Thursday, November 13, 2025
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, Chris Bjorkman, Tom Clark, Tom Fortney, Vice Chair Watkins, Chair Joe Serauskas

ABSENT: Commissioners: Theresa Palazzo

ALSO PRESENT: Director Govind, Planner Schwartz, Associate Planner Subovitz, Sr. Admin Sjodin, Trustee Albuck, Stephen Capela, Mayor Craig

2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE: Recital of the Pledge of Allegiance.

3. ACCEPTANCE OF AGENDA

Motion by Commissioner Alvarez and second by Vice Chair Watkins 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 September 11, 2025.

Voice Vote: All Ayes.

Motion passes.

6. TOWN HALL SESSION: none

7. NEW BUSINESS:

7-a. Conduct a Public Hearing to consider a request by Warren McElwain of New Ventures Development INC for approval of a Master Plan Development (MPD) regulating plan and 1 Design Exception for the development of an approx. 30-unit townhome development at 2140-2170 Devon Ave.

Motion by Commissioner Clark and seconded by Commissioner Alvarez to open the Public Hearing of November 13, 2025.
Voice Roll Call Vote: All Ayes.
Motioned carried.

Planner commented that the largest of the 4 vacant parcels at 2140-2170 Devon is 2170 Devon, so the project is referred to as “the 2170 Devon project.” The applicant is only asking for one Design Exception and the MPD-regulating plan. The site location was displayed on a satellite map. The proposal calls for:

- 30 3-bedroom townhomes
- 1.06 acres of open space (only .32 acres is required per the Code)
- All garages to be off new alleys
- Abundant parking with 126 spaces (only 90 are required per the Code)
- 20 units will face Devon and 10 will face a central open space (the units facing the central open space are the reason for the Design Exception request)

The project is called Pleasant Square and a rough rendering was shown. Planner Schwartz stated that it is more code compliant than the plan is for the area since the Village Center Streetscape Plan calls for all the townhomes to front an open space. The MPD-regulating plan also meets the Code.

Commissioner Alvarez asked if the ownership of the lots is the same as the owner of the lots further west. Planner Schwartz answered that they are.

Chair Serauskas regarding the traffic pattern and if the alleyways go all the way around. Planner Schwartz answered that they do go all the way around the site.

Bill Gruzynski, the petitioner (for Pleasant Square) was sworn in. Bill has known the builder since the 1970s and he displayed past projects by the builder. The builder has projects in Bangs Lake, Deer Park, Palatine, Elk Grove, Schaumburg, and Roselle. Prices for these homes ranged from \$400 to over \$1million. He also said the rendering for Pleasant Square has been updated:

- The gables over the front door have been redesigned to look less monotonous
- The first floor will be all brick and the other floors will be Hardiboard.
- The fronts of the units will have bay windows
- Materials used to build are high-end and the craftsmanship will be high quality
- Prices will be mid to upper \$400k

QUESTIONS & DISCUSSION

There were no questions from the Development Commission.

Barbara Olsen, 2180 Devon Avenue was sworn in. She owns the two remaining properties to the west of this project; about 3.2 acres. She stated her family has owned the property for 95 years and it has always been a nature area. She said the applicant was not interested in purchasing her property, probably due to what her asking price was. She asked if there will be a fence between her property and the proposed project, and where the trash enclosures be placed.

Mr. Gruzynski said individual trash cans will given to each unit to be placed at the end of the driveway on garbage pickup day. A fence can be considered between her property and the project property.

Chair Serauskas commented that her property value will increase once the project is completed, so she should not have a problem selling.

Director Govind commented the Village is trying to develop this area to be developed as our Village Center and our new downtown. Other development proposals will come in the future and we are encouraging more residential development along Devon.

Motion by Commissioner Clark to close the Public Hearing, seconded by Commissioner Alvarez.
Voice Roll Call Vote: All Ayes.
Motion carried.

Planner Schwartz presented the Findings of Fact and recommends the Development Commission move to recommend approval of the requested Major Design Exception, permitting 2/3 of the units to front a designated open space, and the MPD plan with the two conditions and adopt the draft Findings of Fact.

Motion by Commissioner Clark, seconded by Commissioner Alvarez to adopt the Draft Findings of Fact and recommend approval of the Major Design Exception.

Voice Roll Call Vote: All Ayes.

Motion carried.

Motion by Commissioner Clark, seconded by Commissioner Alvarez to approve the MPD with the following conditions:

- 1. The Master Planned Development shall substantially conform to the MPD Regulating Plan, prepared by Manhard Consulting, dated October 16, 2025; and**
- 2. Open spaces and streets shall be designed, landscaped, and maintained per Code.**

Voice Roll Call Vote: All Ayes.

Motion carried.

The request will go before the Village Board at the December 4th meeting.

7-b. Discussion of Potential Future Zoning Code Text Amendments for Level 3 EV Chargers

Planner Schwartz reviewed previously requested potential Text Amendments:

- Reducing the requirement that balconies must be enclosed at least 50%;
- Increasing the maximum balcony façade coverage from 30% of a façade;
- Excluding the 20' required driveway from the 80% façade coverage requirement for Primary Frontage when a Minor Design Exception is granted to permit a driveway along a Primary Street
- Evaluating additional materials to be considered as 'major façade materials'; and
- Permitting some level 3 EV charging stations "by right" with criteria

Planner Schwartz stated that today's discussion is whether all Level 3 EV Chargers should require a Public Hearing or if some can be permitted by right with criteria, reviewed by staff. This only pertains to accessory use Level 3 chargers; the Code provides a definition of what makes it accessory (Sec. 110-6.6):

1. Must be subordinate to and serve the principal building
2. Must be subordinate in area, intensity of use and purpose to the principal building
3. Must contribute to the principal use
4. Must be located on the same zoning lot as the principal structure
5. Must be under the same ownership and control of the principal building
6. It's prohibited prior to the establishment of the primary use

The question for the Commission is if there are circumstances when level 3 chargers do not require a Public Hearing?

Director Govind commented that per the survey included in the packet, only one other municipality (Wheeling) requires a Public Hearing for level 3 chargers.

QUESTIONS & DISCUSSION

Chair Serauskas commented that at a place like Tony's Fresh Market, it's obvious that the chargers would be an accessory use. But if in a parking lot by a small stand-alone store or business, the use should be reviewed.

Commissioner Clark was concerned that if each store owner of a strip mall wanted one or two chargers, there would be just a row of chargers, and asked if the number of chargers allowed is related to the size of the building.

Director Govind replied that the request would have to come from the property owner, not each individual business within a strip mall. EV chargers are generally brought in by an EV charger company, and it is not profitable to own just one, since they are very expensive to have built and installed. They are not regulated by the size of the building.

Planner Schwartz asked if the Commission believes all Level 3 EV charging stations be allowed as permitted uses/by right rather than Special Uses? Options to consider could be:

- Chargers serving 4 or fewer vehicles in commercial districts
- Chargers on parking spaces in excess of Code minimums
- Chargers on Code-compliant parking lots
- Chargers comprising less than 10% of a lot's parking spaces
- A combination of the above options

Director Govind commented that any time a building permit application comes into Inspectional Services, the site plan review will happen at staff level in all departments before a building permit is issued.

Commissioner Fortney was concerned with the "line of sight" and doesn't want rows of chargers to look like Las Vegas with all the lights, especially near residential homes. Nobody would want bright, blinding lights coming into their windows.

Planner Schwartz replied that the amount and brightness of the lights in future proposals could be looked at more closely since it has not yet been an issue.

Chair Serauskas said we could state that chargers cannot face residential areas; they must face into the parking lot.

Commission Alvarez asked if the amount of light emitted regulated? Director Govind said we do not allow signage with lit up panels, and the lighting needs to drop down to only one foot candle at the lot line. Another requirement could be landscaping and screening if needed.

Vice Chair Watkins said to allow by right with criteria attached and require screening from any adjacent residential homes; the Commission agreed.

Planner Schwartz said the next step is a Public Hearing, possible two in December.

8. DEVELOPMENT UPDATES

Director Govind gave updates on developments:

- Raki Restaurant had their grand opening and on November 20 they will hold a wine tasting event
- Chipotle is planning to open on November 18 and may have a ribbon cutting in December
- Other new restaurants opening soon are Alfredo's Pizza & Pasta on Army Trail Road, and Gravitea next to Rocky Patel Cigar Shop which will sell smoothies and sandwiches.
- Small Business Saturday is November 29, so shop local!
- Elite RF received a Made in Illinois Grant of \$50,000
- There is an article about Hanover Park in Business in Focus magazine
- There is a proposal for Phase II of Ontarioville Plaza at the vacant lot next to the animal hospital

Motion by Commissioner Clark, seconded by Commissioner Alvarez to adjourn the meeting.

Voice Roll Call Vote: All Ayes.

Motion carried: Meeting adjourned at 8:07pm

Transcribed by:

Kathy Sjodin
Sr. Admin. Assistant
November 13, 2025

Chair Serauskas



Hanover Park ^{USA}

AGENDA MEMORANDUM

TO: Chairman Serauskas and Development Commissioners

FROM: Shubhra Govind, Director of Community & Economic Development
Alex Schwartz, Village Planner

SUBJECT: **Public Hearing to consider a Text Amendment to Permit Some Level 3 EV Charing Stations to be Permitted Accessory Uses**

ACTION

REQUESTED: Approval Disapproval Discussion/Information

MEETING DATE: **January 8, 2026**

Request Summary

The following is scheduled for a Public Hearing at the Development Commission meeting at 7:00 p.m. on January 8, 2026, in Room 214 of the Municipal Building, 2121 Lake St.:

Consideration of an Amendment to Hanover Park's Comprehensive Zoning Ordinance regarding regulations pertaining to electric vehicle charging, including changes to 110-6.6.2, Accessory uses and structures in nonresidential districts, to establish criteria for allowing some level 3 EV charging stations as accessory permitted uses.

Background

On August 14, 2025, the Development Commission discussed permitting some smaller level 3 electric vehicle (EV) charging stations "by right" with criteria

On November 13, 2025, the Commission further discussed several options for potential Code revisions, including a summary of a survey conducted across 11 Chicago-area suburbs regarding their requirements for Level 3 EV chargers. Staff noted that Hanover Park is the only surveyed community that permits all Level 3 chargers only as a Special Use. As a result, any proposal to install Level 3 EV charging stations, regardless of size, scale, or scope, must go through the public hearing process for approval. Following discussion, the Commission was supportive of allowing some level 3 EV chargers by right. The Commission provided direction on the elements to be considered for a potential text amendment, including the following:

- The Commission did not support setting a maximum parking percentage to delineate when a special use permit is required.
- The Commission supported permitting EV chargers by-right if a parking lot exceeds the number of spaces required by Code.
- The Commission expressed support for establishing a maximum number of vehicles served as the metric for determining when a Special Use Permit would be required.

Analysis

Staff is proposing allowing Level 3 EV chargers "by-right" in two circumstances:

1. If an installation serves 4 or fewer vehicles (commonly requiring two charging boxes total);
or
2. If an installation is on parking spaces above Code minimum requirements.

Staff is also specifically noting that this will trigger Site Plan and Landscaping Plan review.

Based on a brief review of the Village's commercial areas, this would in effect permit only smaller installations or those on particularly large parking lots (like Westview Shopping Center). Please note that practically none of the shopping centers along Irving Park Rd have "surplus" parking.

Standards of Review

Conformity with neighborhood character and existing uses

Level 3 chargers are currently an accessory Special Use. The proposal is only to make some smaller installations permitted accessory uses. Chargers for 4 or fewer cars are not expected to have a negative impact on neighborhood character. By triggering site and landscaping plan review, this may encourage more properties to conform to Code.

Trends of development

EV chargers are increasingly considered an amenity for commercial properties and are being encouraged by the State. The Village has seen an increase in requests for this use.

Environmental impact

EV chargers make the adoption of electric vehicles easier. Electric vehicles have a smaller environmental impact on the Village than the internal combustion vehicles they would replace.

Impact on property values

Staff expects negligible effects on surrounding property values. By triggering site and landscaping plan review, streamlining EV charger approval may encourage more site to be brought to Code.

Compliance with the Hanover Park comprehensive plan

The Comprehensive Plan was adopted in 2010, well before electric vehicles were a major consideration in planning processes. However, sustainability is a major theme of the plan.

"Creation of incentives to foster green development and sustainability: The Village should encourage residents and businesses to use green technology and practice energy conservation via educational campaigns, tax and other incentives and adoption of such uses and practices throughout Village government so as to lead by example."

In particular, Vision 4 states that, "Vision 4: Hanover Park will promote sustainability in land use patterns and development."

Fiscal impact

Staff expects a positive fiscal impact. Additional EV chargers are expected to bring in utility tax revenue and may increase EAV of properties where the chargers are installed.

Staff Recommendation

Staff recommends that the Development Commission make a motion that the Comprehensive Zoning Ordinance is amended as follows – whereby text to be deleted is shown with a strike-through (~~deleted~~), and text to be added is shown in *italics* and underlined.

Sec. 110-6.6 – Accessory uses and structures.

6.6.2. Allowable accessory uses and structures in nonresidential districts.

w. Level 3 electric vehicle charging stations, as accessory special uses. Installations meeting any of the following criteria shall not require special use approval but shall be subject to site plan and landscaping plan review:

1. Installations serving four or fewer vehicles; or
2. Installations on parking spaces in surplus of Code minimum requirements.

Attachments:

Exh. 1: Draft Findings of Fact

FINDINGS OF FACT

Text Amendment to permitting some Level 3 EV Charging Stations to be Permitted Accessory Uses.

I. Subject

Consideration of an Amendment to Hanover Park's Comprehensive Zoning Ordinance regarding regulations pertaining to electric vehicle charging, including changes to 110-6.6.2, Accessory uses and structures in nonresidential districts, to establish criteria for allowing some level 3 EV charging stations as accessory permitted uses.

II. Findings

On January 8, 2026, after due notice as required by law, the Hanover Park Development Commission held a public hearing on the subject request concerning the text amendment. ___ members of the public appeared and voiced their opinion. ___ objectors appeared and ___ written objections were filed.

The Development Commission has made the following findings regarding the Village-initiated text amendment request:

Conformity with neighborhood character and existing uses

Level 3 chargers are currently an accessory Special Use. The proposal is only to make some smaller installations permitted accessory uses. Chargers for 4 or fewer cars are not expected to have a negative impact on neighborhood character. By triggering site and landscaping plan review, this may encourage more properties to conform to Code.

Trends of development

EV chargers are increasingly considered an amenity for commercial properties and are being encouraged by the State. The Village has seen an increase in requests for this use.

Environmental impact

EV chargers make the adoption of electric vehicles easier. Electric vehicles have a smaller environmental impact on the Village than the internal combustion vehicles they would replace.

Impact on property values

The Commission expects negligible effects on surrounding property values. By triggering site and landscaping plan review, streamlining EV charger approval may encourage more site to be brought to Code.

Compliance with the Hanover Park comprehensive plan

The Comprehensive Plan was adopted in 2010, well before electric vehicles were a major consideration in planning processes. However, sustainability is a major theme of the plan.

“Creation of incentives to foster green development and sustainability: The Village should encourage residents and businesses to use green technology and practice energy conservation via educational campaigns, tax and other incentives and adoption of such uses and practices throughout Village government so as to lead by example.”

In particular, Vision 4 states that, “Vision 4: Hanover Park will promote sustainability in land use patterns and development.”

Fiscal impact

The Commission expects a positive fiscal impact. Additional EV chargers are expected to bring in utility tax revenue and may increase EAV of properties where the chargers are installed.

III. Recommendations

Accordingly, by a vote of ___ to ___, the Development Commission recommends approval of the request.



Hanover Park ^{USA}

AGENDA MEMORANDUM

TO: Chairman Serauskas and Development Commissioners

FROM: Shubhra Govind, Director of Community & Economic Development
Alex Schwartz, Village Planner

SUBJECT: Public Hearing to consider Text Amendments to the Village Center Zoning Code, regarding balcony design and driveway façade coverage requirements.

ACTION

REQUESTED: Approval Disapproval Discussion/Information

MEETING DATE: January 8, 2026

Request Summary

The following is scheduled for a Public Hearing at the Development Commission meeting at 7:00 p.m. on January 8, 2026, in Room 214 of the Municipal Building, 2121 Lake St.:

Consideration of Amendments to Hanover Park's Comprehensive Zoning Ordinance regarding potential revisions to the Village Center code, including sec.110-9.8.2.a Minimum Primary Frontage Coverage, to clarify that driveways approved through a Minor Design Exception are exempted from primary frontage calculations; and Sec. 110-9.5.10., Balconies, to allow balconies with less than 50% of the perimeter abutting an exterior wall, separate columns or posts, and greater than 30% façade coverage.

Background

On August 14, 2025, the Development Commission discussed:

- Reducing the requirement that balconies must be enclosed at least 50%;
- Increasing the maximum balcony façade coverage from 30% of a façade;
- Excluding the 20' required driveway from the 80% façade coverage requirement along Primary Facades when a Minor Design Exception is granted to permit a driveway along a Primary Street; and
- Evaluating additional materials to be considered as 'major façade materials';

On September 11, 2025, the Commission further discussed several options for potential code revisions. Following a discussion on balconies, the Commission provided direction on the elements to be considered for potential text amendments, including the following:

- Commissioners indicated support for permitting unenclosed balconies with columns if the structures are architecturally integrated into the building. The commission was supportive of including minimum column sizes.
- Commissioners supported increasing current 30% maximum balcony coverage requirement on street facing facades, seeing balconies an amenity.

Additionally, following discussion on building frontage requirements when a Minor Exception is approved for a driveway off a Primary Street, the Commission supported excluding the approved driveway from frontage coverage calculations.

Analysis

Village Center Balcony Requirements:

Per section 110-9.5.10 of the Village Center code, a minimum 50% of the perimeter of each balcony is required to abut an exterior wall of a building to partially enclose the balconies. Balcony support structures are required to be integrated with the building façade; separate columns or posts are prohibited. Additionally, no more than 30% of a street façade may be covered by balconies.

Staff reviewed recently approved developments and discussion from the September 11 discussion and are making the following recommendations:

1. Permitting balconies to be surrounded by less than 50% of the building wall if structural columns are provided.
2. Permitting columns if they are at least 12" X 12" and incorporated into the architecture of the building.
3. Permitting balconies to cover 50% of a street façade.

This recommendation is based on the feedback from the Commission that Village Center architecture should:

1. Not include "tack on balconies"
2. Balconies should have "integrated designs" (language in the current Code)
3. Permit more balcony space while avoiding the "motel" look

Please note that other façade variety and articulation standards still apply, including requirements that larger buildings be broken up into 90' segments, minimum façade transparency, shadow lines, and approved materials.

Village Center Driveway & Façade Coverage Requirements:

Per sections 110-9.3.5 and 110-9.3.6, general and row buildings in the Village Center must occupy 80% of the width of their building sites. The remaining 20% would need to include setbacks, landscaping, and driveways. While driveways cannot be located on Primary Facades, a Minor Design Exception is permitted if there is no other option (like the proposed daycare across the street or a shallow lot on Devon).

Several proposals have come through (some only conceptual) which qualify for the Minor Exception to have a driveway on a Primary Façade but then need a second Major Design Exception because the driveway plus the required side setback exceed 20% of the width of the lot. See Exhibit 2 for an illustration of such a proposal.

In effect, a site with a single townhome building which could get an administrative Design Exception must still come back for a Major Design Exception simply because the lots aren't wide enough to accommodate the building and driveway and still have 80% of the site occupied by the building. Per Code, Townhome buildings can be no more 125' wide (and occupy at least 80% of the lot), meaning the maximum remaining 20% would be only about 31'. Driveways are typically 20' wide and the required setback is 10'. Therefore, townhome sites would only have 1' remaining for any landscaping on the driveway side of the building. This also assumes an existing lot that is exactly the right size.

Staff is recommending that a driveway, approved via a Minor Design Exception, be exempt from this frontage calculation. For the example in Exhibit 2, this proposal would permit up to 10' of landscaping along the driveway side.

Staff Recommendation

Staff recommends that the Development Commission make a motion that the Village Center zoning section of the Comprehensive Zoning Ordinance is amended as follows – whereby text to be deleted is shown with a strike-through (~~deleted~~), and text to be added is shown in *italics* and underlined.

Balconies

Sec. 110-9.5.10 – Balconies

e. *Integrated design.* Balconies are intended to be integrated with the design of the façade, and tacking (or the appearance of tacking) the balconies onto the façade after the elevation has been designed must be avoided.

1. A minimum of 50 percent of the perimeter of each balcony shall abut an exterior wall of the building, partially enclosing the balcony, or shall include structural columns.
2. The balcony support structure shall be integrated with the building façade; separate columns or posts supporting ~~any balcony from the ground are prohibited.~~ balconies are permitted if they are at least 12" X 12" in width and are fully incorporated into the architectural design of the building façade.

g. *Façade coverage.* A maximum of ~~30~~ 50 percent of the street façades, calculated separately for each façade, may be covered by balconies. The balcony area is calculated by drawing a rectangle around the following: the platform or floor of the balcony; any rails, walls, columns or indentations; and any ceiling, roof, or upper balcony.

Driveway & Façade Coverage

Sec. 110-9.8.2 – Measuring

9.8.2. *Measuring.* The following explains the standards outlined on the tables in 110-9.3, Building types and uses, specific to each building type, refer to 9.3.5 through 9.3.8.

- a. *Minimum primary frontage coverage.* The minimum percentage of building façade along the primary frontage of a lot is designated on each building type table.
 1. *Measurement.* The width of the principal structures (as measured within the build-to zone along the frontage edge) is divided by the length of the frontage parallel to the boundary line, right-of-way line, or property line following the street. Refer to Figure 8-H. A boundary line is designated on the master development plan to delineate the space of a street or building site. When a Minor Design Exception to 110-9.3.4.f.5. Driveways Off Primary Streets is granted, the width of the approved driveway shall not be included in the length of the frontage for frontage coverage calculations.

Attachments:

- Exh. 1: Draft Findings of Fact
Exh. 2: Driveway Exhibit

FINDINGS OF FACT

Text Amendments regarding balcony design and driveway façade coverage requirements.

I. Subject

Consideration of Amendments to Hanover Park's Comprehensive Zoning Ordinance regarding potential revisions to the Village Center code, including Sec.110-9.8.2.a Minimum Primary Frontage Coverage, to clarify that driveways approved through a Minor Design Exception are exempted from primary frontage calculations; and Sec. 110-9.5.10., Balconies, to allow balconies with less than 50% of the perimeter abutting an exterior wall, separate columns or posts, and greater than 30% façade coverage.

II. Findings

On January 8, 2026, after due notice as required by law, the Hanover Park Development Commission held a public hearing on the subject request concerning the text amendments. ___ members of the public appeared and voiced their opinion. ___ objectors appeared and ___ written objections were filed.

The Development Commission has made the following findings regarding the Village-initiated text amendment request:

Conformity with neighborhood character and existing uses

The proposal is consistent with approved Village Center projects and the Village's vision for the Village Center. Under the proposed code revisions, future development proposals would have more flexibility to complement previously approved projects that received similar design exceptions under existing regulations. Balconies are an amenity and the proposed changes enable provision of balconies with columns that are better integrated architecturally. The driveway width exclusion from the frontage calculation allows for room for landscaping and clarifies how the frontage should be calculated in case of minor design exceptions.

Trends of development

Certain building types are required to occupy 80% of a lot's frontage. Current Village Center Code standards effectively require a very narrow range of lot widths where a project can comply with the 80 percent maximum building site coverage requirement when a Minor Design Exception is granted to allow a driveway on a primary façade. The intent of providing the Minor Exception for driveways on primary facades was to streamline approvals when an alternative is not available. However, in practice, these projects would require a Major Design Exception, and a public hearing. Exempting driveways from primary frontage calculations when approved through a minor design exception would make compliance with the 80 percent maximum more achievable and allow greater opportunities for landscaping along driveways.

Modern development proposals frequently incorporate greater architectural variety and larger balconies. While a "motel" look is not desirable, the Commission finds that generous balcony space can be an amenity to residents. Existing enclosure requirements and limitations on balcony support structures can constrain these design elements, particularly in multi-unit developments where visible structural supports are common and desirable architectural features.

Environmental impact

Modifying façade coverage requirements would allow for increased landscaping and integration of green space, which may help reduce the extent of impermeable surfaces in new developments. Otherwise, no impact is expected.

Impact on property values

The proposed Village Code modifications are expected to have a positive impact on property values by making good development easier. By allowing greater design flexibility, the amendment may facilitate additional landscaping within the Village Center district.

Compliance with the Hanover Park comprehensive plan

Goal 2.1 of the Comprehensive Plan calls for enhancing housing diversity to support varying income levels, ages, and preferences. In particular, Objective 2.1.3 calls for the Village to encourage infill residential development on vacant properties and redevelopment of under-utilized properties. This Amendment would simplify the approval process, encouraging infill development on vacant properties, development of higher-end housing, and mixed-use, higher-density residential developments.

Fiscal impact

The Village Center amendments would simplify the approval process by reducing the need for design exceptions, which may encourage additional development, increase residential housing opportunities, and strengthen Hanover Park's tax base.

III. Recommendations

Accordingly, by a vote of ___ to ___, the Development Commission recommends approval of the request.



80% OF 120' = 96' REQUIRED
 120' - 20' (driveway) - 10' (setback) = 90' MAX POSSIBLE