

**AGENDA**  
**PARK FOREST PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION**

**Park Forest Village Hall**  
**Board Room**

**7:00 P.M.**

**TUESDAY**  
**October 14, 2025**

1. Planning and Zoning Commission Call to Order
2. Review of Minutes
  - a. September 9, 2025, Regular Planning and Zoning Commission Meeting
3. Petitions
  - a. Public Hearing - Zoning Map Amendment: Vladimir Kuznetsov, 226 Monee Road, Park Forest, IL 60466 - *Continuation*
4. Audience to Visitors
  - a. John Kindseth, Village Manager, Park Forest
5. New Business
  - a. Review – 226 Monee Road, Park Forest, IL 60466 - Annexation Petition
6. Old Business
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](mailto: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, September 9, 2025**

**Present:** Chair Vernita Wickliffe Lewis; Vice Chair Marguerite Hutchins; Commissioners Samuel Brooks, Cynthia Burton-Prete, Denise Poston, Doug Price; Trustee Liaison John Moore

**Staff:** Andrew Brown, Assistant Director of Economic Development and Planning

**Absent:** None.

**Visitors:** Christina Sparks; Tim Colburn; Elizabeth Colburn; Cherrie Johnson-Malone; Jamie Bradley; and Serghei Blajco.

**Call to Order:** Wickliffe Lewis called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

**Review of Minutes:**

**a. May 13, 2025, Regular Planning and Zoning Commission Meeting**

On page 3, under Old Business in the second paragraph where it states, "...recommended that the metro lot should be rezoned..." the word "metro" to "Metra."

On page 3, under Old Business at the beginning of the third paragraph, "Wicliffe" should be changed to "Wickliffe."

On page 3, under Old Business in the last sentence of the fourth paragraph, "And last,..." should be changed to "And lastly,..."

On page 3, under Old Business in the fifth paragraph it states, "...they have or use new fields in terms of..." the word "fields" should be changed to "approaches."

A motion to approve the minutes with correction was made by Price and seconded by Brooks. All in favor. The minutes were approved.

**Petitions:**

**a. Public Hearing – Zoning Map Amendment: Vladimir Kuznetsov, 226 Monee Road, Park Forest, IL 60466**

**Wickliffe Lewis opened the public hearing at 7:07 p.m.**

**The floor was turned over to the Planning and Zoning Commission Liaison Brown**

Brown reviewed the staff report regarding the Zoning Map Amendment for 226 Monee Road. He presented a PowerPoint showing the three parcels located in Will County jurisdiction. Brown stated that the petitioners are requesting all three parcels be changed from the current zoning C-2 (Will County), which allows motor vehicle repair amongst other land uses but does not include motor vehicle sales, to C-3 (Village of Park Forest), which allows both vehicle repairs and sales amongst other land uses.

A notice of the public hearing was published in the Daily SouthTown Newspaper on August 24<sup>th</sup>. Also, the hearing was sent to all 22 property owners within 250 feet of the property via the United States Postal Service and signs noting the date, time, and purpose of the public hearing were posted along both the Monee Road and Tamarack Street frontages of the property.

Price asked general questions about property ownership in the area, zoning, and how zoning would work if they were annexed into the Village.

**The floor was then turned over to the petitioner.**

Bradley took the podium and introduced himself and spoke on behalf of the owners. Bradley noted that one of the owners, Serghei Blajco, was present. Bradley stated that he was one of the engineers working on the site plan for the Zoning Map Amendment and Annexation Petition. Bradley stated that from his understanding, the owners are going to resume the operation of motor vehicle repair from the property and would like to add motor vehicle sales. They want to annex under the Village of Park Forest so that they can utilize one zoning code and one zoning district and sell motor vehicles.

Wickliffe Lewis inquired why the business wanted to annex into Park Forest.

Price inquired if they intended to have access from Tamarack Street for current and future services. Blajco stated no, access will continue to be on Monee Road.

Price then inquired if just using Monee Road as an access road would be sufficient with the owners wanting to add motor vehicle sales. Blajco stated that it will be since it will be a small dealership where he would have a maximum of ten cars to sell on the lot at any given time.

To gain a better understanding of what type of car dealership the owners are looking to be, Burton-Prete provided a couple of scenarios. The first scenario was where a person dropped their car off for repairs but couldn't pay for them and then the motor vehicle repair shop would or could sell that vehicle and another scenario was where a person may want to sell their car but was having trouble selling it and the businesses could then assist in the sale of the motor vehicle. Blajco stated that, yes, in both of those given scenarios, his business would be able to sell the motor vehicle.

Price inquired that with the current C-2 zoning (Will County), would the property owner still be allowed to apply for access on Tamarack Street through the Village? Brown stated that yes, they could apply to have access on Tamarack Street regardless of being annexed and the zoning changed or staying with their current zoning and remaining in Will County.

Wickliffe Lewis inquired about when the other owner would be back in town because the responses given did not provide the information that they would like to properly evaluate the Zoning Map Amendment. She wanted to get more input on a different level and discussed if it was practical to reschedule the Zoning Map Amendment deliberation for a later date.

Price stated that he felt the Planning and Zoning Commission had wandered off the topic of the Zoning Map Amendment by asking questions about the nature of the business and business owner. He thought asking questions about the business was not relevant to considering the facts for the Zoning Map Amendment.

Wickliffe Lewis stated that because they were deliberating on the Zoning Map Amendment and not the Annexation Petition, she felt like they were putting the “cart before the horse” on the order of entitlements. Price responded by saying that he thought the way things were presented were more transparent as all the entitlements and agreements would be in front of the Board of Trustees at the same time. Wickliffe Lewis stated that she felt the Western Avenue annexation had much more analysis completed before that annexation was considered. Price interjected by saying an annexation like the one being presented with the Zoning Map Amendment fit with what the Village Plans, and the Village Policy had been trying to do for years. Wickliffe Lewis understood Price’s points but noted that she felt more due diligence was needed.

Burton-Prete asked Blajco about where he and his partner Vladimir Kuznetsov lived. Blajco stated that he lives in Frankfort, Illinois and would be the main person executing the partnership and operating the business. Blajco explained that he has an agreement to act as a representative of their partnership.

Burton-Prete agreed with Wickliffe Lewis and Price on not getting enough information from the petitioner and staying on the topic of the Zoning Map Amendment. Burton-Prete recommended to the other Commissioners that the meeting be structured similarly to previous Public Hearings and thought the petitioners could and should address questions that Commissioners ask.

Brooks inquired whether Blajco manages the day-to-day operations. Blajco confirmed that he is responsible for these activities, noting that his partner resides out-of-state and serves primarily as a partner who supports the business finances. Bradley explained that there were two other gentlemen who were helping with the annexation process as Blajco did not have the experience in annexations and English was his second language. Brooks then inquired about how many years the business had been at the location. Bradley responded by saying the business had been at the location for 35 years, but Blajco and his partner had just purchased the properties about six months ago.

Poston noted that she was supporting the idea of tabling the Zoning Map Amendment for later. Poston stated that they thought Commissioners should be able to ask questions and be clear to make sound decisions. Poston felt like there was a language barrier with Blajco and it was challenging the Commission’s ability to make a sound decision. A question Poston had for Blajco was what the advantage was for his business and properties to annex into Park Forest.

Blajco noted that the biggest advantage was being able to sell motor vehicles under the Village's zoning, and all the property would be the same.

Trustee Moore asked Brown what other Commissions are involved in this process. Brown stated that if an incentive was involved, the Economic Development Advisory Group would take part in the incentive process. Brown stated that at this moment there were no other Commissions or Groups that would be a part of this process.

### **Wickliffe Lewis turned the floor over to the public attendees**

#### **Audience to Visitors:**

The first to speak was Cristina Sparks, a Park Forest resident. Sparks stated that she has been a resident on Tamarack Street for a little over a year. Sparks attended the meeting to learn more about what's going on at 226 Monee Road. Sparks stated that her main concern was traffic and if it would increase with the Zoning Change. She stated that Tamarack Street is a beautiful residential street where kids play so she did not want to see that disturbed. However, she also stated that on the other hand, this Zoning Map Amendment has the potential to bring more business to Park Forest. She asked that if a new business was added and the Village would benefit through a reduction in the property taxes, which would help provide the residents with some relief. Sparks thanked the Commissioners for giving her a platform to speak.

The next resident to speak was Tim Colburn. Colburn asked the owner a few questions regarding the existing motor vehicle repair business. Colburn asked if Blajco and his partnership now own all three businesses on the properties and if the motorcycle repair shop was still in business. Blajco answered yes to both questions. For the Commission, Colburn asked that if the annexation and rezoning have been changed to C-3 (Park Forest), if the additions to the property were completed or the business expanded, would the owner have to comply to the Village's ordinance that specifies things like ingress, egress, signage, the height of the buildings, landscaping, et cetera. Colburn asked this because it would impact how the business is developed and may affect the traffic situation. Brown asked if the Commission wanted the staff liaison to answer all questions from the public as this was not how Public Hearings had been completed previously. Price suggested that during Commission's deliberations, the Commissioners should try to answer any questions regarding whether there are any C-3 (Park Forest) landscaping and development requirements for the public attendees.

The last resident to speak was Cherrie Johnson-Malone. Johnson-Malone mentioned that she has lived in Park Forest, Will County for 10 years. She indicated she received information about the meeting and acknowledged there are both advantages and disadvantages to the property being zoned C-3 (Park Forest). She expressed a need to learn more about the topic.

**A motion to close the public hearing was made by Price and seconded by Hutchins. All in favor. The public hearing was closed at 8:08 p.m.**

Price made a point of order and stated that there were at least two Commissioners who thought the discussion for the Zoning Map Amendment should be delayed. The Commissioners

discussed whether they should move forward with deliberating over the eight (8) standards during that meeting or postponing the deliberation until the October 14<sup>th</sup> meeting. Wickliffe Lewis and Burton-Prete noted that earlier in the meeting there was language barrier with Blajco and that they had more questions than answers regarding the petition for the Zoning Map Amendment. Wickliffe Lewis and Burton-Prete extended that they would like to postpone the deliberation until the next meeting when the rest of the development group was available to attend the meeting. Price again voiced his concerns regarding the Commissioners blurring the lines of what they can ask regarding the nature of the type of business verses safety issues, egress, landscaping, etc. Price asked if the PZC should have legal counsel during their meetings where there is a petition involving entitlements so that the PZC's questions remain germane to the petition.

Poston stated that she felt like every Commissioner should have the ability to ask questions or respond without feeling overtalked. She was concerned that there were more questions that needed to be asked, and the Commissioners were unable to ask them.

Hutchins inquired about who would also be attending the October 14<sup>th</sup> meeting with the property owners' team. Brown noted that Mr. David Oxley and another business partner would be in attendance.

Price noted that when the PZC gets into petitions, he gets a little dogmatic. Burton-Prete stated that she wants to make a well-informed decision. She doesn't want a future business to have an environmental issue or something like that. If the PZC asking more detailed questions results in a better business in the long run, then those questions were worth it. Price noted that changing the zoning would allow for the maximum use of that parcel. Wickliffe Lewis stated that in all the previous deliberations the PZC was able to delve into comprehensive questioning and felt like if that didn't happen this time, it would not allow for the PZC's clear thought. Price disagreed and felt that more comprehensive and less germane lines of questioning for the Zoning Map Amendment could open the Village up to issues. Wickliffe Lewis stated that she had conferred with Brown about the agenda and that she felt like the PZC should get something in writing according to the PZC's ability to investigate things so they will not overstep in their deliberation. Price noted that the PZC may want to consider having legal counsel at meetings and referenced Locke.

Price made a motion to delay consideration of the eight (8) standards until the next formal meeting on October 14, 2025. The motion was seconded by Poston. Five (5) Commissioners were in favor and one (1) (Price) opposed. The motion passed. The consideration of the Zoning Map Amendment has been postponed until the October 14<sup>th</sup> meeting.

Brown inquired if the PZC would like an FAQ answering all the public's questions for the next meeting. Price and Wickliffe Lewis said they thought that would be a good idea.

## **New Business:**

### **a. Zoning Map**

Brown presented the new official zoning map to the Commissioners that is on the Village of Park Forest website on the map page. Brown compared the old zoning map to show how difficult it was to read and interpret different zoning districts. Brown then displayed the new map to compare the two maps. The new map allows anyone to input a location and get a zoning district read out immediately. Brown noted that this will be helpful for developers and residents.

**Old Business:** None.

**Communications:**

- a. **Member Communications:** Burton-Prete asked when they will get to meet the new Village Manager, Jon Kindseth. Trustee Moore said that he has encouraged him to come to all the committee and commission meetings to introduce himself.
- b. **Trustee Comments:** Trustee Moore gave an update on the Aqua Center. He stated that the cost to upgrade the Aqua Center had increased after the inspection by the Illinois Department of Health. Originally, the plan was to have two pools and a splash pad. Now the new recommendation is to have one pool and one splash pad. The Village was hoping to open the Aqua Center back up in 2026, but now it's looking to be open back up in 2027. The Village Manager and Finance Department stated that a bond expiring this year has been paid down, which could be used to finance the construction without increasing taxes for residents.
- c. **Staff Communications:** The next PZC meeting will be October 14<sup>th</sup>. The next meeting after that would be November 11<sup>th</sup>, which is Veteran's Day. The Village Hall will be closed that day. Wickliffe Lewis suggested that they should skip the November meeting unless they need to meet. Brown stated that they can schedule it for the third Tuesday, November 18<sup>th</sup>, if they need to meet. The meeting for December will be on December 9<sup>th</sup>.

Brown mentioned that he had not heard anything from Cook County regarding the STAMPS Plan for Sauk Trail.

Brown stated that Economic Development and Planning Department has been working on a transit-oriented development RPQ/P for 12 acres at the properties located near 3250 Lincoln Highway.

Brown then stated that the developer for Access South Cook has changed their flyer to a waiting list sign-up. If anyone is interested in the development, they can now sign up for the waitlist. According to their timeline, the developer should be opening their first building early next year. According to the developer, about 600 people have signed up so far.

Lastly, Brown stated that the Home Repair and Accessibility Program Round Two should be closing with the Illinois Housing Development Authority soon. The Village applied for and was awarded \$600,000 for Round 2 funding. The maximum per project has gone

up. Now a homeowner can have their roof work up to \$25,000 and a full rehab or accessibility improvement project can cost up to \$50,000. The program is income-based.

**Adjournment:** A motion to adjourn was made by Hutchins and seconded by Burton-Prete. All in favor. The meeting was adjourned at 9:00 p.m.

When acting in a quasi-judicial manner for a zoning map amendment involving specific parcels, a Planning and Zoning Commission must function like a court, focusing on facts and applying existing laws to those facts. The commission's primary role is to be an impartial, fact-finding body that creates a complete public record and makes a recommendation based solely on evidence presented at the hearing, measured against the standards in the community's ordinances and comprehensive plan (Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning [CMAP], 2011, p. 8). It may not make policy decisions or be swayed by popular opinion (American Planning Association, 1989, p. 1).

## What the Commission May Do (The Requirements)

A commission acting in a quasi-judicial capacity has a specific set of duties and procedures it must follow to ensure a fair and legally defensible process.

### Act as Impartial Judges

Commissioners are expected to act like judges: beyond error, above reproach, and within the law (Hunter & Driscoll, 1996, p. 2). Their attitude and conduct should be judicial and impartial (McQuillan, as cited in American Planning Association, 1989, p. 2). This requires objectivity—an ability to listen to opposing views while distinguishing between fact and opinion to determine where the real public interest lies (Solnit, n.d., p. 7). Fairness in a hearing exists when all participants are given an opportunity to present evidence to an unbiased decision-maker (Hunter & Driscoll, 1996, p. 2). Even the *appearance* that a commissioner cannot act in a fair manner may prohibit them from hearing and voting on a matter (Hunter & Driscoll, 1996, p. 3).

### Follow Procedural Due Process

Courts demand that commissioners follow unwritten rules known as "procedural due process" (Hunter & Driscoll, 1996, p. 2). This legal method governs everything from the application filing to the final decision and is required in quasi-judicial hearings where the property rights of interested parties are at issue (CMAP, 2011, p. 8). The key elements include:

- An **appearance of fairness** for decision-makers (Hunter & Driscoll, 1996, p. 2).
- **Proper notice** of the hearing (Hunter & Driscoll, 1996, p. 2).
- A **proper hearing process** (Hunter & Driscoll, 1996, p. 2).
- A **complete record** (Hunter & Driscoll, 1996, p. 2).
- A **decision based on the record** that meets legal requirements (Hunter & Driscoll, 1996, p. 2).

### Conduct a Fair and Orderly Hearing

The public hearing is a fact-finding forum (Bair, n.d., p. 20). The chairperson plays a key role in conducting the meeting in an **orderly and businesslike fashion** (Smith, n.d., p. 5).

- **Administer Oaths:** Testimony by witnesses at any zoning hearing "shall be given under oath" (CMAP, 2011, p. 28). The chairperson is empowered to administer these oaths (Bair, n.d., p. 10).
- **Control the Proceedings:** The hearing must be a controlled environment that allows all parties an opportunity to present testimony (Hunter & Driscoll, 1996, p. 3). The chair should maintain order and decorum, reminding speakers to limit remarks to new points and

prohibiting disruptions like booing, hissing, or shouting from a seat (Hunter & Driscoll, 1996, p. 3; Bair, n.d., p. 10).

- **Allow Cross-Examination:** In a quasi-judicial hearing, all parties must have the opportunity to question their opponents' witnesses (Smith, as cited in Bair, n.d., p. 20). Applicants for zoning variations and special uses in municipalities have a statutory right to cross-examine witnesses (CMAP, 2011, p. 29).

### **Build a Complete and Factual Record**

All land-use decisions must be based on the **official record**—testimony and exhibits—developed at the public hearing (Hunter & Driscoll, 1996, p. 3). This is critical because courts will review and rely upon this record to reach a decision on an appeal (Hunter & Driscoll, 1996, p. 3). It is essential to keep accurate and reasonably complete records, which means a stenographic record of all testimony is preferable to skeletal minutes (Smith, as cited in Bair, n.d., p. 24). Any personal knowledge commissioners rely on must be discussed and made part of the record so interested parties can respond (American Planning Association, 1989, p. 2).

### **Base the Decision on Evidence and Established Standards**

The commission's decision must be based on the evidence presented at the hearing (CMAP, 2011, p. 8). The petitioner has the **burden of proof** to submit evidence demonstrating compliance with ordinance standards (American Planning Association, 1989, p. 1). The commission must apply the appropriate legal criteria found in local ordinances and state statutes (Hunter & Driscoll, 1996, p. 4).

To do this, the commission must make **written findings of fact** (American Planning Association, 1989, p. 2; Hunter & Driscoll, 1996, p. 4). These are statements derived from the record that support the decision and explain how the facts satisfy (or fail to satisfy) the required legal criteria, such as those for a zoning amendment (Hunter & Driscoll, 1996, p. 4; Sullivan & Marston, 2012, p. 7).

## **What the Commission May Not Do (The Prohibitions)**

To maintain the integrity of the quasi-judicial process, there are several actions and considerations a commission must avoid.

### **Be Swayed by Public Opinion or Popularity**

A commission does not conduct a popularity poll (Smith, n.d., p. 11). An applicant should not be denied a fair hearing simply because opponents turn out in force or collect signatures on a petition (American Planning Association, 1989, p. 1). No statute or ordinance makes the popularity of a proposed use one of the standards for a decision (Smith, as cited in American Planning Association, 1989, p. 1). When the opinion of the majority of neighbors conflicts with the ordinance, the commission must choose between upholding the law or being swayed by public opinion (Chandler, as cited in American Planning Association, 1989, p. 1). A zoning decision cannot be made based on how many people are for or against an issue (Smith, n.d., p. 11).

### **Consider Irrelevant Information or Emotional Arguments**

The board's decision must be based on information that can be supported and is accurately presented (Smith, n.d., p. 4). The board should not be interested in **emotional arguments or extraneous statements** (Smith, n.d., p. 4). A skilled orator should not be more successful than someone who presents proper facts concisely (Smith, n.d., p. 5). The commission may exclude irrelevant, immaterial, incompetent, or unduly repetitious testimony (Bair, n.d., p. 21). Factors such as a desire to make more money from the property or the identity of the property owner are generally not appropriate considerations (CMAP, 2011, p. 49).

### **Engage in Private Communications or Consider Evidence Outside the Hearing**

All interested parties must have an opportunity to hear or see all evidence considered by the commission (Smith, as cited in Bair, n.d., p. 24). Private communications with decision-makers, known as **ex parte contact**, deprive other parties of the chance to respond and destroy the credibility of the hearing process (CMAP, 2011, p. 24). The commission may not rely on information gained through interviews or examination of records outside the hearing room, nor may it rely on reports received after a public hearing is closed (Anderson, as cited in Bair, n.d., p. 22).

### **Make Legislative or Policy Decisions**

In a quasi-judicial role, the commission's function is to apply adopted policy to a specific application, not to establish new policy (CMAP, 2011, p. 8). A legislative decision involves general facts affecting everyone, whereas a quasi-judicial decision affects a small number of persons based on a particular set of disputed facts (CMAP, 2011, p. 8). The commission is acting in a fact-finding capacity, not drawing the lines of demarcation for community-wide use, which is the province of the legislative body (CMAP, 2011, p. 8).

### **Allow Conflicts of Interest**

A decision will not be permitted to stand if it involves an official with a **financial or other personal interest** in the outcome (Smith, as cited in Bair, n.d., p. 24). No board member should

participate in a case where they have a personal or monetary interest in the property or will be directly affected by the decision (Bair, n.d., p. 14). Members must disclose any potential conflict of interest and disqualify themselves from the case (Bair, n.d., p. 14).

## References

American Planning Association. (1989, October). Recommendations for Zoning Hearings. *ZONING News*.

Bair, F. H., Jr. (n.d.). *The Zoning Board Manual*. Planners Press, American Planning Association.

Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning. (2011). *Handbook of Planning Law Principles and Practices for Northeastern Illinois*.

Cogan, E. (2000). *Successful Public Meetings: A Practical Guide*. Planners Book Service, American Planning Association.

Hunter, T., & Driscoll, J. (1996, Summer). The Planning Commissioner as Judge. *The Commissioner*, 2-4.

Smith, H. H. (n.d.). *The Citizen's Guide to Zoning*. Planners Press, American Planning Association.

Solnit, A. (n.d.). *The Job of the Planning Commissioner* (3rd ed.). Planners Press, American Planning Association.

Sullivan, R., & Marston, L. (2012). *Citizen Planner Workshop*. Illinois Chapter, American Planning Association.

Torma, C. (1999). Meeting Management Made Easy. *The Commissioner*.

# Frequently Asked Questions

## 226 Monee Road Zoning Map Amendment

The Village of Park Forest has prepared this FAQ to address questions and concerns raised by residents at the recent Planning and Zoning Commission meeting on September 9, 2025, regarding the proposed Zoning Map Amendment for the property located at 226 Monee Road.

---

### General Information & Traffic Concerns

#### **What is the proposed zoning change for 226 Monee Road?**

The property at 226 Monee Road is being considered for a **Zoning Map Amendment** to change its current zoning classification to **C-3 (Corridor Commercial)**. This change would allow for a broader range of commercial uses on the site, potentially bringing in new businesses and/or uses.

#### **How will the zoning change affect traffic in the area, especially on Tamarack Street?**

The potential impact on traffic is a key consideration for the Village. Any new business or expansion at 226 Monee Road would be required to comply with Village ordinances and undergo a thorough review to ensure that traffic flow, access points, and parking are managed safely and efficiently. The Village's review process would include an analysis of potential traffic impacts to minimize any negative effects on surrounding residential streets like Tamarack Street.

---

### Property Ownership & Business Operations

#### **Who owns the businesses on the properties at 226 Monee Road and is the motorcycle repair shop still in operation?**

The owner and his partnership now own all three businesses on the properties. The motorcycle repair shop is still in business.

---

### Village Ordinances & Development Requirements

#### **If the property is rezoned to C-3 and annexed into the Village, would the owner have to comply with Village ordinances for things like landscaping, signage, and building height?**

Yes. If the Zoning Map Amendment and Annexation Petition are approved, any future additions, expansions, or new developments on the property would be required to comply with all Village of Park Forest ordinances, including those specific to the **C-3 General Commercial District**.

This includes regulations for:

- **Ingress and Egress:** How vehicles enter and exit the property to ensure safe traffic flow.
- **Signage:** The size, type, and location of all signs.
- **Building Height:** The maximum allowable height for any new or expanded structures.
- **Landscaping:** The requirements for green space, tree preservation, and screening to improve aesthetics and mitigate the impact on surrounding properties.

These requirements are in place to ensure that any development is consistent with the Village's vision and doesn't negatively impact the community.

---

# **Frequently Asked Questions**

## **226 Monee Road Zoning Map Amendment**

### **Potential Benefits to Residents**

**If a new business is annexed into the Village, will it help reduce property taxes for residents?**

Bringing in new businesses can contribute to the Village's overall tax base through sales tax revenue and commercial property taxes. A larger and more diverse tax base can help reduce the tax burden on residents. While a direct, immediate reduction in individual property taxes can't be guaranteed, the Village aims to create a stronger local economy that provides long-term financial benefits to the entire community.