

AGENDA
PARK FOREST PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION

Park Forest Village Hall
Board Room

7:00 P.M.

TUESDAY
March 12, 2024

1. Planning and Zoning Commission Call to Order
2. Review of Minutes
 - a. February 13, 2024 Regular Planning and Zoning Commission Meeting
3. Petitions - None
4. Audience to Visitors
5. New Business - None
6. Old Business
 - a. Short Term Rental Discussion
7. Communications
 - a. Member Communications
 - b. Trustee Comments
 - c. Staff Communications
8. Adjournment

Any individual with a disability requesting a reasonable accommodation in order to participate in a public meeting should contact the Village Manager's Office at least 48 hours in advance of the scheduled meeting. The Village Manager's Office can be reached via telephone at 708-283-5605 or via email at athurston@vopf.com. Every effort will be made to allow for meeting participation.

**Park Forest
Planning and Zoning Commission Meeting Minutes
Park Forest Board Room
Tuesday, February 13, 2024**

Present: Chair Vernita Wickliffe Lewis; Vice Chair Marguerite Hutchins; Commissioner Samuel Brooks, Cynthia Burton-Prete, Denise Poston, Doug Price

Staff: Andrew Brown, Assistant Director of Economic Development and Planning, Planning & Zoning Commission Staff Liaison

Absent: Trustee Liaison John Moore

Visitors: None.

Call to Order: The meeting was called to order at 7:02 pm.

Review of Minutes for January 9, 2024:

On page six (6) under ‘Staff Communications’ where it states “Adjustments have been made to the buildings yet all conditions for the special use permit have been met.” A period needs to be added after ‘buildings,’ ‘the’ added before ‘adjustments’ and ‘Therefore’ added instead of yet.

A motion to approve the minutes with corrections was made by Price and seconded by Hutchins. All in favor. The motion was carried.

Petitions: None.

Audience to Visitors: None.

New Business:

a. 2023 Accomplishments Review & 2024 Goals and Objectives

During the meeting, Brown presented the draft of the Planning and Zoning Commission's 2023 Accomplishments and the Goals and Objectives for 2024 to the Commissioners for review.

Burton-Prete raised a query regarding the phrasing of a 2023 accomplishment. She suggested that the final statement under Goal 1 in the 2023 Accomplishments should be revised to read, "The Planning and Zoning Commission tabled the discussion and recommendation to January and February 2024." In response, Brown agreed to adjust the wording of Goal 1's accomplishments according to Burton-Prete's suggestion.

Following the discussion, Hutchins moved to approve the PZC 2023 Accomplishments and 2024 Goals and Objectives with the proposed amendments, and Brooks seconded the motion. The

motion received unanimous approval from the Commissioners, thereby adopting the goals with the specified changes.

Old Business:

a. Request for a Special Use Permit in the C-2 Mixed Use Zoning District at 350 Main Street

Brown reported that the decision regarding the special use permit, originally tabled during the January 9, 2024 meeting, was postponed due to the submission of new information by the applicant to the Commissioners. The Commissioners would now revisit all five standard criteria in light of this new information being presented.

1. *The proposed special use will not endanger the health, safety, comfort, convenience and general welfare of the public.*

Brooks voted in favor of the proposal. He acknowledged the health, safety, comfort, convenience, and general welfare concerns raised by Legacy Square homeowners, particularly their disdain for the term "rent" due to their long-term residency. However, Brooks argued that the addition of two apartment buildings would not detrimentally affect these aspects for the public.

Burton-Prete opposed the proposal, citing unresolved reservations about the development's impact on residents' privacy through landscaping. While she acknowledged that the development did not pose a direct threat to public health and welfare, she expressed doubts about its ability to ensure residents' safety, comfort, and convenience. She reiterated her previous stance that the development would compromise these elements, noting a requirement for the developer to submit detailed landscaping plans to the Building Department.

Poston also voted against the proposal, aligning with Burton-Prete's concerns about the project's effect on individual well-being, without specifying how these impacts could be mitigated.

Price supported the proposal, emphasizing the commission's duty to evaluate the development's impact on the general public rather than specific subgroups. He pointed out that all submitted plans focused on addressing traffic and density issues in the DownTown area, underscoring the importance of determining the best outcome for the public at large.

Hutchins voted in favor, asserting that the development would not compromise the public's health, safety, comfort, convenience, or general welfare.

Wickliffe Lewis opposed the proposal, arguing that the concerns of the 150 notified individuals, as part of the general public, should be prioritized in the commission's deliberations, highlighting their significance in assessing the development's overall impact.

For the first Special Use Permit Standard the Commission then voted as follows: Three (3) vote (Brooks, Price, and Hutchins) in the affirmative with the first Standard and three (3)

votes (Burton-Prete, Poston, and Wickliffe Lewis) in opposition to the assertion of the first Special Use Permit Standard.

2. The proposed special use is compatible with the character of adjacent properties and other property within the immediate vicinity of the proposed special use.

Brooks voted in favor, expressing his belief in the development's compatibility with the surrounding area. He highlighted not only the proximity to Legacy Square but also the consideration of co-ops across the street and the townhouse development near Walgreens, affirming that the new buildings would harmonize with existing structures.

Burton-Prete opposed the proposal, stating the need for a more comprehensive plan before feeling comfortable with an affirmative vote.

Poston supported the proposal, succinctly stating that the special use proposed is deemed compatible with the area.

Price, who had previously voted against the proposal in an earlier meeting, revised his stance to support the development, citing its compatibility as the reason for his change of heart.

Hutchins also voted in favor, indicating agreement with the proposal's compatibility.

Wickliffe Lewis voted in support, drawn to the development's compatibility and future potential. She mentioned the planned brickwork of the structures, which reminded her of the architectural style of Victory Center, as a positive aspect influencing her decision.

For the second Special Use Permit Standard the Commission then voted as follows: Five (5) votes (Brooks, Hutchins, Poston, Price, and Wickliffe Lewis) in the affirmative of the second Special Use Permit Standard and one (1) Commissioner (Burton-Prete) voted in the opposition to the assertion of the second Special Use Permit Standard.

3. The proposed special use will not impede the normal and orderly development and improvement of adjacent properties and other property within the immediate vicinity of the proposed special use.

The commission reviewed the third Special Use Standard, focusing on whether the proposed special use would impede the normal and orderly development and improvement of adjacent properties and other property within the immediate vicinity.

Brooks voted in favor, affirming, "It will not impede."

Burton-Prete voted in favor, affirming, "It will not impede."

Poston voted in favor, affirming, "It will not impede."

Price voted in favor, affirming, "It will not impede."

Hutchins voted in favor, affirming, "It will not impede."

Wickliffe Lewis voted in favor, affirming, "It will not impede."

For the third Special Use Permit Standard the Commission then voted as follows: Six (6) votes (Brooks, Burton-Prete, Hutchins, Poston, Price, and Wickliffe Lewis) in the affirmative of the third Special Use Permit Standard.

- 4. The proposed special use will be provided with adequate utilities, access roads, drainage and/or other necessary facilities.***

Brooks voted in favor, affirming the proposal's compliance with providing adequate utilities, access roads, drainage, and other necessary facilities.

Burton-Prete also voted in favor, echoing the sentiment that the proposed special use meets the requirements for adequate infrastructure.

Poston supported the proposal, agreeing on the adequacy of utilities, access roads, and necessary facilities for the special use.

Price, continuing the unanimous support, voted in favor, recognizing the proposal's provision for adequate infrastructure.

Hutchins cast a vote in favor, confirming the proposal's compliance with the standard regarding utilities and facilities.

Wickliffe Lewis voted in favor, completing the unanimous agreement that the proposed special use will be sufficiently equipped with the required utilities, access roads, and other facilities.

For the fourth Special Use Permit Standard the Commission then voted as follows: Six (6) votes (Brooks, Burton-Prete, Hutchins, Poston, Price, and Wickliffe Lewis) in the affirmative of the fourth Special Use Permit Standard.

- 5. The proposed special use is consistent with the intent of the elements of the Comprehensive Plan, the Unified Development Ordinance, and other land use policies of the Village.***

The commission deliberated on the fifth Special Use Standard, assessing whether the proposed special use aligns with the Comprehensive Plan, the Unified Development Ordinance, and other land use policies of the Village.

Brooks voted in favor, confirming the proposal's consistency with the mentioned guidelines.

Burton-Prete voted against, expressing concerns over insufficient information to definitively assess the proposal's alignment with the comprehensive planning and policy frameworks.

Poston voted in favor, affirming the proposal's consistency with the necessary standards and guidelines.

Price voted in favor, also supporting the proposal's adherence to the relevant planning documents.

Hutchins voted in favor, agreeing on the proposal's compatibility with the Comprehensive Plan and related policies.

Wickliffe Lewis voted in favor, recognizing the proposal's alignment with the intent of the comprehensive planning and regulatory documents.

For the fifth Special Use Permit Standard the Commission then voted as follows: Five (5) votes (Brooks, Hutchins, Poston, Price, and Wickliffe Lewis) in the affirmative of the fifth Special Use Permit Standard and one (1) (Burton-Prete) in opposition to the assertion of the fifth Special Use Permit Standard.

Price proposed a motion to recommend the approval of the Special Use Permit (SUP) by the Board of Trustees based on the fulfillment of four out of five standards outlined in the SUP Standards Worksheet, along with the incorporation of all recommended conditions listed in the Staff Report dated November 28, 2023. Burton-Prete seconded the motion.

A roll call vote ensued: Brooks voted in favor, Burton-Prete opposed, Hutchins supported, Poston was in favor, Price voted in favor, and Wickliffe Lewis supported the motion. Consequently, the motion was approved with a vote of 5 to 1.

Communications:

- a. **Member Communications:** Hutchins shared her experience attending the Park Forest Oscars, noting the event was well-received with nearly full attendance.

Burton-Prete raised a question regarding Walgreens' official departure from Park Forest, including the closing date. Price confirmed that Walgreens' last operational day would be February 29th. Wickliffe Lewis inquired about the reason behind Walgreens' closure, to which Brown responded that despite inquiries, Walgreens did not provide a clear reason for their decision.

Burton-Prete inquired about the status of the ordinance concerning immigrants being transported to Park Forest. Brown clarified that the ordinance had passed, stipulating fines for not notifying the Village prior to such busing activities.

Poston questioned the plan of action should a bus transporting immigrants arrive in Park Forest and whether there would be preparations for such an event. Brown explained that the response would depend on the specific situation, mentioning that coordination with

Fire and Police services to facilitate transport to Chicago is part of the plan, along with support from other Village facilities aiming to manage the arrival effectively.

Brooks asked about the progress of the 41-unit development project, inquiring if it had been presented to the Village Board. Brown updated that the project was approved, with adjustments increasing the unit count to 44. He mentioned that development is scheduled to begin the following month, with a closing date set for the 19th.

b. Trustee Comments: None.

c. Staff Communications: Brown mentioned that Cook County recently launched the "Healthy Homes for Healthy Families" program aimed at assisting homeowners with home repairs. This initiative is applicable to approximately two to three census tracts within Park Forest, offering up to \$60,000 in repair assistance per eligible home. The program is administered by Cook County in partnership with Elevate Energy.

In a related development, the Illinois Housing Development Authority has introduced a public grant program available to residents of both Cook and Will counties. This program also provides homeowners with the opportunity to receive up to \$60,000 for repairs, contingent upon meeting the median income requirements for their household size. Additionally, applicants must demonstrate a COVID-related economic hardship to qualify for assistance under this scheme.

Adjournment: A motion to adjourn the meeting was made by Burton-Prete and seconded by Hutchins. All in favor. The meeting was adjourned at 8:51 pm.

DATE: February 6, 2024

TO: Chair Vernita Wickliffe Lewis, Planning and Zoning Commission
Andrew Brown, Staff Liaison

FROM: Chair Phil Perkins, Economic Development Advisory Group
Sandra Zoellner, Staff Liaison

RE: Short Term Rental Policy

At the joint meeting of the EDAG and PZC, the EDAG was charged with compiling reasons that someone would want to be a short term rental host, why someone would want to rent a short term rental in Park Forest and any benefits to the Village of Park Forest.

Over the course of three EDAG meetings, the members compiled the following lists for the PZC to consider.

Reasons to Host:

1. There are no hotels, motels or bed and breakfasts in Park Forest
2. Provides flexibility and new income source
3. Improve property amenities
4. Capitalize on local events in Park Forest and nearby
5. Provides revenue to enhance overall value and aesthetic of the home

Reasons to Rent in Park Forest:

1. Alternative to hotel, motel and lodging in south suburbs
2. Proximity to certain activities and events – golf tournaments, GSU graduation, and more
3. Host holiday events, family and school reunions
4. Location – take advantage of mid-century modern homes and outdoor serenity (in Thorn Creek Woods or view of Central Park)
5. Affordable alternative to hotel for large group
6. Alternative location for in-service training or work retreats
7. Nearby Metra lots, with easy access to Downtown Chicago, Museum Campus and more
8. Proximity to Kankakee State Park, Indiana Dunes, Indiana State Park, Indiana National Park, and Credit Union One Amphitheater in Tinley Park
9. Seasonal amenities – Art Fair, Main Street Nights, House Music Night, Aqua Center, Tennis & Racquet Club, pickle ball tournaments, seasonally decorated DownTown Park Forest, and much more
10. Theater 47 and Freedom Hall performances – performers and/or audience

Reasons the Corporate Village would want a short term rental policy

1. Regulating an approved use is a practical response versus chasing an unregulated, illegal use.
2. Potential Transient Guest Tax - Communities can reinvest this revenue into marketing efforts that highlight their destination to more visitors and boost the local economy. Short-term rentals offer a creative solution to increasing funding for destination marketing. With the right tools and processes, governments can increase short-term rental tax compliance and, in turn, fund tourism marketing, essentially reducing reliance on property taxes to offer and market events and activities.