



**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE
PLAN COMMISSION, VILLAGE OF TINLEY PARK,
COOK AND WILL COUNTIES, ILLINOIS**

July 17, 2025

The meeting of the Plan Commission, Village of Tinley Park, Illinois, was held in the Council Chambers located in the Village Hall of Tinley Park, 16250 Oak Park Avenue, Tinley Park, IL on July 17, 2025.

CALL TO ORDER – CHAIRMAN GRAY called to order the regularly scheduled meeting of the Plan Commission on July 17, 2025 at 7:05 p.m.

Michael O. Whalen, Associate Planner, called the roll.

Present Plan Commissioners: James Gaskill
Terry Hamilton
Eduardo Mani
Andrae Marak
Amanda Martinez
Edgar Montalvo
Steve Sepessy
Chairman Garrett Gray

Absent Plan Commissioners: Angela Gatto

Village Staff: Michael Coleman, Interim Community Development Dir.
Michael O. Whalen, Associate Planner

Petitioners: Mike Hackett, Gas N Wash
Chris Kalischefski, WT Group

Members of the Public: Carlos Williams

COMMUNICATIONS – Michael Whalen noted that Item 2 on the agenda was noticed as a public hearing to amend the Special Use Permits granted in 2023, but that the item would actually be heard as a public meeting for Site Plan/Architectural Approval by the Plan Commission.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES – Minutes of the July 3, 2025 Plan Commission meeting were presented for approval. CHAIRMAN GRAY requested a motion to approve the minutes. COMMISSIONER MONTALVO made a motion to approve the minutes of the July 3, 2025 Plan Commission meeting. COMMISSIONER SEPESSY seconded the motion. All were in favor. Motion carried.

TO: VILLAGE OF TINLEY PARK PRESIDENT AND BOARD OF TRUSTEES

FROM: VILLAGE OF TINLEY PARK PLAN COMMISSION

SUBJECT: MINUTES OF THE JULY 17, 2025 REGULAR MEETING

ITEM 1: PUBLIC HEARING – DOWNTOWN CORE STREETScape MASTER PLAN

Consider recommending that the Village Board approve the proposed 2025 Downtown Streetscape Master Plan.

Present Plan Commissioners: James Gaskill
Terry Hamilton
Eduardo Mani
Andrae Marak
Amanda Martinez
Edgar Montalvo
Steve Sepessy
Chairman Garrett Gray

Absent Plan Commissioners: Angela Gatto

Village Staff: Michael Coleman, Interim Community Development Dir.
Michael O. Whalen, Associate Planner

Petitioners: none

Members of the Public: none

CHAIRMAN GRAY introduced item #1. He noted the item was requested to be continued to the August 21, 2025 meeting.

CHAIRMAN GRAY requested a motion to continue the public hearing for Item 1. COMMISSIONER MANI made the motion to continue the hearing. COMMISSIONER GASKILL seconded the motion. Voice Vote. All were in favor. Motion carried.

TO: VILLAGE OF TINLEY PARK PRESIDENT AND BOARD OF TRUSTEES

FROM: VILLAGE OF TINLEY PARK PLAN COMMISSION

SUBJECT: MINUTES OF THE JULY 17, 2025 REGULAR MEETING

ITEM 2: PUBLIC MEETING – GAS N WASH – 18301 LA GRANGE ROAD – SITE PLAN/ARCHITECTURAL APPROVAL

Consider approving the revised plans relating to retaining wall finish treatments and landscaping enhancements at 18301 LaGrange Road in the B-3 (General Business and Commercial) zoning district.

Present Plan Commissioners: James Gaskill
Terry Hamilton
Eduardo Mani
Andrae Marak
Amanda Martinez
Edgar Montalvo
Steve Sepessy
Chairman Garrett Gray

Absent Plan Commissioners: Angela Gatto

Village Staff: Michael Coleman, Interim Community Development Dir.
Michael O. Whalen, Associate Planner

Petitioners: Mike Hackett, Gas N Wash
Chris Kalischefski, WT Group

Members of the Public: none

CHAIRMAN GRAY introduced Item 2.

Michael O. Whalen, Associate Planner, presented the staff report.

CHAIRMAN GRAY invited the petitioner to speak.

Mike Hackett of Gas N Wash said that the location opened in December, which was too late in the season to do anything with the wall. He said the material that they approved was form-liner concrete. He said that the team was concerned with the maintenance and longevity of the concrete, which is how they determined to use the masonry coating. He added that Gas N Wash takes pride in their locations and keeps them very clean. He said that the coating, in addition to the proposed landscaping, would improve the appearance of the wall.

Chris Kalischefski of WT Group said that the walls on the toll roads were crumbling. He said that Gas N Wash takes care of its facilities. He said the proposed coating would improve the appearance

of the wall. He said the proposed landscaping would reduce the visibility of the wall. He said the proposed coating was high end, and that they would use a high-nap roller to apply the coating to give a textured finish. He presented renderings of the effect of the landscaping. He noted the wall is 502 feet long and up to 12 feet tall.

CHAIRMAN GRAY read the condition about the wall from the 2023 approval. He asked the Petitioner what materials were indicated in the permit documents for the wall. Chris Kalischefski said, at the time, they did not know if the engineering of the site would merit the use of retaining walls. CHAIRMAN GRAY noted the Petitioner's insistence during the 2023 entitlement process that the gas station be located as close to the corner as possible, which would require reversing the natural grade of the site. Chris Kalischefski said they determined a wall would be required about six months after the zoning approval was received. Mike Hackett confirmed this timeline. Chris Kalischefski stated that stormwater from the north side of 183rd Street had to be conveyed through the Gas N Wash site and into the stormwater pond. He said the Village's engineering consultant required that this water be conveyed by overland flow across the pavement of 183rd Street, rather than below the street in pipes. He said this engineering decision required substantially increasing the overall height of the retaining wall.

Chris Kalischefski asserted that cost was not a concern in designing the retaining wall.

CHAIRMAN GRAY asked who made the decision that the wall would be a concrete cast in place retaining wall. Chris Kalischefski said the wall had to be cast in place concrete because of site engineering constraints. He said that only the northwest corner of the site was raised so that the site would be level.

CHAIRMAN GRAY again asked who made the decision on the wall's design and construction. He again noted the condition from the 2023 approval. He also asked if and when the Village was informed about the chosen construction method and final design finish of the retaining wall. He said he understood that the wall could not be demolished and rebuilt to meet the condition of the 2023 approval, but said that, when a contractor makes a mistake or deviates from the plans approved by the Village, the Village requires that issues be addressed, sometimes by demolishing completed work and rebuilding to match approved plans.

Mike Hackett said the Village was involved and was aware of the construction method. He asserted that it was not Gas N Wash's decision to use that construction method or the final finish of the wall. Chris Kalischefski asserted that the plans and designs for the wall construction and its final finish were on the plans which were approved by the Village and the Village's engineering consultant. He added that outside approvals from other agencies prolonged the permitting process. Chris Kalischefski said that, if engineering constraints related to stormwater conveyance had not necessitated an increase in height of the retaining wall, they would have used landscape pavers and the wall would have been about seven feet tall. He said this would have also been much cheaper.

COMMISSIONER MANI said the wall was not aesthetically pleasing at all. He said the wall is horrible. He said that, as an architect, he is familiar with the process of determining which products to use for his projects. He said that he spoke to a representative from Sherwin Williams who

confirmed that the proposed coating will not create a smooth finish over rough concrete. He said that all the product will do is change the color of the wall but that the roughness from the cast lines will still be visible. He said he rejects the proposal to use the proposed coating because it will do nothing to improve the visual appearance of the wall. He said the wall should be clad in masonry as was agreed to during the 2023 approval.

Chris Kalischefski said that Gas N Wash's gas stations are nice and clean. He said that the proposed landscaping would eventually conceal the wall. He said they are not proposing a clean, flat finish on the wall. COMMISSIONER MANI stated that his conversation with the Sherwin Williams representative made it clear the product would not do anything to the appearance other than changing the color. Chris Kalischefski said they also spoke with a representative from Sherwin Williams who recommended the proposed coating to seal the concrete.

CHAIRMAN GRAY asked about the thickness of the coating relative to the thickness of a coat of paint. He noted that he has been approached by several people in the Village that have commented on the appearance of the wall. He said that he agrees that Gas N Wash does a good job of maintaining its properties, but stated that this wall is unique from all the other Gas N Wash gas stations that he's been to. He said that he understands the coating may be necessary to protect and seal the concrete.

COMMISSIONER MANI again stated that the wall should be clad in thin brick.

COMMISSIONER HAMILTON said that sometimes bare, flat concrete is used for surfaces. He said that it is sometimes used as an architectural design choice and may be textured to give a uniform finish.

CHAIRMAN GRAY said that a painted pattern on the concrete could improve the appearance.

COMMISSIONER SEPESSY said the wall is unsightly. He said he is okay with the proposed landscaping.

COMMISSIONER MARTINEZ said this was not an ideal situation for the Village. She said that it sounded like the Petitioner was attempting to scapegoat the Village's engineering consultant, when engineers would not typically give input regarding designed finishes. She said that the site engineering might have dictated the height of the wall and the need for a structurally engineered solution as opposed to stacked landscape pavers. She noted that one of the standards listed in the Plan Commission's standards for Site Plan/Architectural approval is that architectural finishes are required. She said that not only does the proposal not fulfill the requirement imposed by the condition in the 2023 approval, but it also does not comply with these standards. She said it seemed there were several missed opportunities to plan better to create a better finish on the wall. She added that the landscaping will not conceal the wall for a long time while the trees and shrubs grow. She said that even the rendering presented by the Petitioner shows large sections of the wall. She said that she agreed with COMMISSIONER MANI that applying a coating to the concrete was not sufficient. She said that thin brick or some other veneer to match the brick construction of the buildings on site is what the Plan Commission was trying to get at.

COMMISSIONER MANI asked staff if had discussed the retaining wall finish with the Petitioner prior to the issuance of the temporary certificate of occupancy. Michael Whalen said that the wall issue was regularly discussed with the Petitioner. He also noted that all permits issued by the Village for the project listed conditions relating to the design finish of the retaining wall. He said that the mass grading permit requested by the Petitioner explicitly included a condition regarding the wall finish. Michael Coleman, Interim Community Development Director noted that the mass grading permit scope was only to move dirt to get the site more level. He said that there were about ten concrete inspections which observed the structural elements of the wall before the concrete was poured. He added that one of the conditions on the temporary certificate of occupancy was that a masonry material finish was required for the retaining wall. Michael Coleman said that staff was encouraging the application of a thin brick with a stainless-steel screed to match the contour of the land. He said that the Petitioner was very concerned with the cost of this option. COMMISSIONER MANI stated that it was just the cost of doing business. He added that the Petitioner must be held accountable.

CHAIRMAN GRAY said that he agreed with COMMISSIONER MARTINEZ that the Petitioner did not take care to follow the conditions of approval. He added that the Plan Commission recently required that the proposed Tru by Hilton hotel immediate south of the Gas N Wash must comply with the Village's masonry standards. He said that there must be consistency. He said he agreed with COMMISSIONER MANI's comment that it was just the cost of doing business. He said that the masonry finish should have been installed when the wall was constructed.

Michael Whalen presented the standards.

Michael Whalen noted that the proposed motion for Site Plan/Architectural approval would strike the condition regarding the retaining wall from the 2023 approval, which would allow the Petitioner to instead apply the proposed coating and install additional landscaping. COMMISSIONER MARAK asked if the proposed motion could be modified before a vote was taken. Michael Whalen confirmed that it could.

CHAIRMAN GRAY asked if any of the Commissioners would like to modify the proposed motion. COMMISSIONER MANI said he would not like to allow the Petitioner to use the proposed coating. He said he wants to see an alternate proposal.

COMMISSIONER MARTINEZ asked the Petitioner if he would be amenable to continuing the discussion to the next meeting so that the Plan Commission would not have to vote to deny the proposal during this meeting. Mike Hackett said not necessarily. He said he was frustrated. He said that since the engineering changed, it was not their fault that the wall was so large. CHAIRMAN GRAY said he disagreed and said that the Petitioner was responsible for the wall. COMMISSIONER MARAK said that, regardless of the height of the wall, the condition stipulated the wall must have masonry to match the buildings. He said that the proposed coating does not meet the Plan Commission standards for approval. COMMISSIONER MARTINEZ said that the engineers are not responsible for the architectural finish of structures, only the actual engineering. She said she does not think any engineer would tell them that the wall should look as it does.

Chris Kalischefski said the product is high end. He said the team was open to adding more trees to screen the wall. He said that he was concerned about the maintenance burden of cladding the wall in thin brick. He said bricks will pop out. He said that his client was not concerned with the cost of the project.

COMMISSIONER MANI said that the main issue is with the community's standards which generally require masonry. Chris Kalischefski said he feels the proposal exceeds the community's standards. COMMISSIONER MANI said that, based on his conversation with the Sherwin Williams representative, he disagrees. Chris Kalischefski asked COMMISSIONER MANI to provide the contact information of the representative he spoke with.

Mike Hackett said they discussed the project with several paint manufacturers and determined the proposed coating was the best product available. He reiterated that they are not concerned with cost and said that the owner of Gas N Wash visits this location multiple times per day. He said the owner is very concerned with the appearance of his gas stations.

COMMISSIONER MANI said that if cost is not a factor, they should clad the wall in brick.

CHAIRMAN GRAY said that regardless of all other factors, this was a condition on the original approval in 2023 that they were well aware of.

Chris Kalischefski said that he felt the condition would be fulfilled by painting the wall beige since that color is present on small architectural accents throughout the site.

COMMISSIONER MARTINEZ said the condition did not stipulate anything about color, only the actual material. CHAIRMAN GRAY said that paint would not be considered a material.

COMMISSIONER MARTINEZ asked about the maintenance schedule of the proposed coating versus the maintenance of brick cladding. Chris Kalischefski said that they would generally repaint every six years. He said the brick finish on the toll roads is falling apart. CHAIRMAN GRAY disagreed that the environment on the toll roads was not the same as the environment on La Grange.

COMMISSIONER GASKILL said the weather causes veneer finishes to heave.

CHAIRMAN GRAY said that if a masonry veneer is installed properly to eliminate the risk of water infiltration, there is a much lower risk of heaving.

Michael Coleman said that the materials installed on the toll roads also deal with constant vibration from vehicles and further degradation from road salt exposure. He asked the Petitioner what the plan was to keep the wall clean from dirt and debris because the Village will receive calls if the wall is dirty. He also asked if there was any cost analysis done to assess the difference between thin brick veneer and the proposed coating.

Chris Kalischefski said they will get a cost analysis to staff. He said that the proposed coating is self-cleaning. He reiterated that cost is not a factor.

COMMISSIONER MANI said that if cost is not a factor, they should fulfill the condition and clad the wall in masonry.

CHAIRMAN GRAY asked if the Petitioner investigated adding thin brick and the maintenance burden of the material in the context of the site. He said that he couldn't imagine products being sold in this region that cannot withstand even one winter cycle. Mike Hackett said the director of construction at Gas N Wash spoke with several distributors and determined that the material will fail and bricks will pop off. He said the free-thaw cycle and snowplows projecting snow, slush, and salt onto the wall as they clear the road are major issues. CHAIRMAN GRAY asked if there was a recommended maintenance schedule for brick veneer. Mike Hackett said he did not know, but said that they felt the material just will not hold up over time. He added that there would be no cleaning issue with the proposed coating. He also added that IDOT approved the landscaping. Chris Kalischefski said they are willing to add more landscaping.

COMMISSIONER HAMILTON asked if it would be possible to apply some sort of pattern while applying the coating, which could reduce the appearance of the cast lines on the concrete. Mike Hackett said he will look into it. CHAIRMAN GRAY said that some sort of pattern could trick the eye.

CHAIRMAN GRAY said the main issue is that the proposal does not fulfill the condition.

COMMISSIONER HAMILTON said that, based on the discussion, it sounds like the petitioner feels that installing thin brick would be a mistake.

CHAIRMAN GRAY said that a routine maintenance schedule could reduce the risk of water infiltration.

COMMISSIONER MANI said that the longevity of thin brick installations all comes down to the skill of the installer. He said that he has designed projects in the region that use thin brick and has not had any issues with bricks popping off because his projects use skilled masons. He said that the water infiltration that causes bricks to pop can be avoided by using skilled labor.

COMMISSIONER GASKILL said the old Granite City restaurant in Orland Park has several bricks missing. CHAIRMAN GRAY said that building is vacant, so it isn't being actively maintained. COMMISSIONER GASKILL said the brick was falling apart before they closed.

Chris Kalischefski asked about the implications and procedure if the Plan Commission does not approve the request.

Michael Whalen said that the Plan Commission has final authority to approve or deny Site Plan/Architectural petitions. He added that if the Plan Commission denies the request, the Petitioner can then appeal the decision to the Village Board, which has the authority to overturn the disapproval or refer the petition back to the Plan Commission.

COMMISSIONER MARTINEZ asked if the minutes of this meeting would be forwarded to the Village Board should the Petitioner appeal the decision. Michael Whalen said yes.

COMMISSIONER MARTINEZ then asked if a disapproval would impact the temporary certificate of occupancy. Michael Whalen said that the final certificate of occupancy cannot be issued until all items and conditions on the temporary certificate of occupancy are complete. He said the temporary certificate of occupancy can be extended beyond its expiration in August. Michael Coleman said that he has the authority to grant up to two 90-day extensions on a temporary certificate of occupancy. He added that since there are no life safety issues, he would extend the occupancy permit if needed. He also said that the Village Board has no interest in closing a business for an issue like this.

CHAIRMAN GRAY agreed that no one wants to shut them down over this. He asked if the Petitioner was sure they did not want to request a continuance. Mike Hackett requested the item be continued.

Chris Kalischefski asked what would happen in the event of a tie vote. One of the Commissioner said that would not be an approval.

COMMISSIONER MONTALVO said that he has worked with cast concrete in the past. He said that applying a finish once the concrete is cured is very costly and creates maintenance issues. He said that the most cost-effective option to achieve the desired effect would have been to lay the bricks against the forms before pouring the concrete. He said he is personally okay with the proposal.

COMMISSIONER MANI said that if there are concerns with a thin brick veneer, a rainscreen wall could be installed where water infiltration would occur between the existing concrete wall and the brick structure, which would eliminate infiltration into the brick itself and reduce maintenance issues. He said that since the petitioner stated several times that cost is not a factor, they should finish the wall in masonry, and there are multiple ways of doing so.

CHAIRMAN GRAY said he has concerns with the coating, even though it will look better than nothing.

COMMISSIONER GASKILL said the Petitioner did not say the proposed coating would give a smooth, uniform finish. He said the wall will not be noticeable with the landscaping.

COMMISSIONER MANI said all it will do is change the color.

Mike Hackett asked to clarify the potential outcomes of the vote. He asked what would happen in the event of a tie. CHAIRMAN GRAY said a tie would be the same thing as a no vote. CHAIRMAN GRAY said if the motion does not pass, they would have an option to appeal the decision to the Village Board. Mike Hackett asked if the Plan Commission continued the item to the next meeting, would they expect them to explore other options. CHAIRMAN GRAY said yes. Mike Hackett said he did not know what those options would be, but that he would work on it.

Michael Whalen asked the Commissioners if there was anything specific they wanted the Petitioner to bring to the next meeting, should they vote to continue the item. CHAIRMAN GRAY said he wanted to see something to indicate the viability and maintenance of thin brick.

Mike Hackett said that he received a text message during the discussion from a member of his construction team that said that cladding the wall in masonry would likely last about two years before issues could come up.

CHAIRMAN GRAY said he would like to see that thin brick is not viable and see if there are any other alternatives available.

Mike Hackett said he would explore other options.

CHAIRMAN GRAY requested a motion to continue the item. COMMISSIONER GASKILL made the motion to continue. COMMISSIONER MANI seconded. Voice vote. All were in favor. Motion carried.

Michael Whalen confirmed the next meeting is August 7th.

Good of the Order

Michael Coleman said that the grand opening of Harmony Square was the next day. He said there were a few inspections scheduled. He said the project took 14 months.

Pete's is proceeding with installation of rooftop mechanicals and paving the parking lot.

The Magnuson apartment project was switching to site build construction so they could move more quickly.

Westpoint townhouses would be beginning construction soon.

Jack-in-the-Box would be open during the first week of August.

Receive Comments from the Public

Carlos Williams said the wall at Gas N Wash was ugly and he hoped to see it improved.

Adjournment

CHAIRMAN GRAY requested a motion to adjourn the meeting.

COMMISSIONER SEPESY made a motion to adjourn the meeting. COMMISSIONER MARTINEZ seconded the motion. CHAIRMAN GRAY requested a voice vote; all were in favor. The meeting adjourned at 8:24 p.m.