Village of Arlington Heights
Plan Commission
Board Room, 3rd Floor
Arlington Heights Village Hall, 33 S. Arlington Heights Rd.
June 8, 2022
7:30 PM

I. CALL TO ORDER

II. ROLL CALL

IIIAPPROVAL OF MINUTES

A. Chapter 28 Text Amendment - Adult Cannabis Dispensaries - 5/25/22

IV.PUBLIC HEARINGS

V. OTHER BUSINESS

A. Plan Commissioner Training Session

VI.ADJOURNMENT

Persons with disabilities requiring auxiliary aids or services, such as an American Sign Language interpreter or written materials in accessible formats, should contact Rosangela Maldonado, at 33 S. Arlington Heights Road, Arlington Heights, Illinois 60005, rmaldonado@vah.com or (847)368-5791.

Plan Commission
6/8/2022

Item: Chapter 28 Text Amendment - Adult Use Cannabis Dispensaries - 5/25/22

Department: Planning & Community Development

ATTACHMENTS:

Description	Type
Chapter 28 Text Amendment - Adult Use Cannabis Dispensaries - 5/25/22	Minutes

PLAN
COMMISSION

REPORT OF THE PROCEEDINGS OF A PUBLIC HEARING
BEFORE THE VILLAGE OF ARLINGTON HEIGHTS
PLAN COMMISSION

RE: CHAPTER 28 TEXT AMENDMENTS - ADULT USE CANNABIS DISPENSARIES - PC #22-005

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS had before the Village of Arlington Heights Plan Commission Meeting taken at the Arlington Heights Village Hall, 33 South Arlington Heights Road, 3rd Floor Board Room, Arlington Heights, Illinois on the 25th day of May, 2022 at the hour of 7:30 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

MARY JO WARSKOW, Acting Chairperson
JOE LORENZINI
BRUCE GREEN
TERRY ENNES
JOHN SIGALOS
JAY CHERWIN
GEORGE DROST

ALSO PRESENT:

BILL ENRIGHT, Deputy Director
HART PASSMAN, Village Attorney

DRAFT

ACTING CHAIRPERSON WARSKOW: All right, I'd like to call the Plan Commission to order. If we could all stand and say the Pledge of Allegiance?

(Pledge of Allegiance recited.)

ACTING CHAIRPERSON WARSKOW: Great.

Bill, if you can call roll?

MR. ENRIGHT: Sure.

Commissioner Cherwin.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: Here.

MR. ENRIGHT: Commissioner Drost.

(No response.)

MR. ENRIGHT: Commissioner Ennes.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Here.

MR. ENRIGHT: Commissioner Green.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Here.

MR. ENRIGHT: Commissioner Lorenzini.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Here.

MR. ENRIGHT: Commissioner Sigalos.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: Here.

MR. ENRIGHT: Chair Warskow.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON WARSKOW: Here.

All right, our first business is to approve the minutes from the May 11th Plan Commission hearing. Do I have a motion?

COMMISSIONER ENNES: I'll make that motion.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: I'll second it.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON WARSKOW: Okay, all say aye if you're in favor.

(Chorus of ayes.)

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: I abstain, it's Jay. I wasn't here.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON WARSKOW: Okay, and we have only one petition on the agenda today, George Drost just walked in, and that is the Text Amendment.

So, I believe you are the Petitioner?

MR. ENRIGHT: Yes, the Village of Arlington Heights is the Petitioner. I'm Bill Enright, Assistant Director of Planning, and Hart Passman is the Village Attorney consultant who drafted the ordinance. So, he is well versed in the law and this particular ordinance.

This ordinance went in front of the Ordinance Review Committee a couple of weeks ago on May 11th and received unanimous support and recommendation to the Plan Commission for public hearing tonight. What the Plan Commission is reviewing is a text amendment to Chapter 28 zoning to add definitions related to adult use cannabis dispensaries, as well as amending the permitted use table to allow adult use cannabis dispensaries in the B-2 and B-3 Zoning Districts and none others. There's also a line item for the parking section to add a parking ratio requirement for adult use cannabis dispensaries. Also, there is an addition to Chapter 28 limiting the number of dispensaries in the Village to three total maximum, one in each of three geographic areas which I'll get into in a second.

This ordinance, that was discussed by the Village Attorney, the Village Manager, and the Director of Planning and myself, reflects the Village Board's discussion on this issue on February 21sth of 2022 where the Board was looking at codifying adult use cannabis dispensaries in town. It's not allowed in our zoning right now; however, it is allowed via

DRAFT

a pilot program ordinance that was adopted a couple of years ago by the Village Board to allow Verilife at the south end of town at Arlington Heights Road and Golf to operate on a pilot program. They extended it a couple of times, that pilot program expires the end of June. So, the Board directed Staff and the Village Attorney to draft an ordinance that would address the issue from a zoning perspective for adult use cannabis dispensaries in town.

So, what you have before you is what we believe, at the administration level, reflects what the Board had discussed in February. This would obviously, this is the public hearing tonight to consider these text amendments, and the Plan Commission can certainly make whatever recommendations you see fit. What you have, as I mentioned earlier, there's two zoning districts that we'd be looking at allowing this as of right, the B-2 and the B-3. Now, the B-2 and B-3 are most of our larger or small shopping centers, so pretty much anything on major arterial that's a shopping center is either B-2 or B-3. The B-5 District downtown we're not recommending allowing these here. There was some discussion by the Board on that, and I think the will of the Board was to not have them in the downtown because of the mix of uses downtown and potentially parking issues. But however, we don't see any major issues since cannabis dispensaries tend to be relatively small.

We've done some parking studies of other towns regarding parking. The main issues that other towns had regarding parking is when they allow dispensaries in their industrial parks. As you all know, typically the industrial parks don't have a significant amount of parking in terms of their development. So, when you bring in uses that are more intense along the lines of either medical office or retail, industrial wouldn't typical have much parking to meet those needs.

So, in some of the towns that we've researched, they did have parking issues in industrial areas. However, we're not recommending that these go in industrial areas. Towns that allow them in commercial zoning districts is because the centers typically, especially the larger ones, have a lot of parking and usually have ample parking, maybe once in a while you'll see, maybe during the holidays, they get crowded. But for the most part, the larger shopping centers, commercial districts don't have parking issues and we don't think that adult use cannabis would cause parking issues in larger centers. Some of the smaller centers that they might go into, you know, you may, that's why we're recommending one space for every 200 square feet which is more aligned with medical office versus retail.

Verilife did a very comprehensive parking and traffic study of their existing site at Golf and Arlington Heights Road which it presented to you in a packet and found that there weren't any major parking issues or traffic issues with their use of that location. Also, the Police Department has not had any significant issues at the Verilife site.

So, the three areas that we're looking at allowing these, you know, there would be one per geographic zone, one area being north of Hintz up to Lake Cook Road which is the Village's northern limits, and then the second area would be from Hintz Road all the way south to Central Road. So, that would encompass a lot of that Rand Road corridor where we have five large shopping centers as well as some, you know, some smaller ones. Most of those are zoned B-2, B-3.

There are some limits with the state with respect to proximity to schools, and I believe it's 1,000 feet?

MR. PASSMAN: Yes, I believe that's right.

MR. ENRIGHT: Yes. So, you know, none of these can go within 1,000 feet of a school and I believe daycares as well. So, the southern border of this middle zone would be

Central Street as I mentioned, or Central Road rather, and then the southern portion or area would be south of Central all the way to I-90 which is the Village's southern limits. So, you would probably see something in the, you know, Golf Road-Arlington Heights Road corridor in terms of the larger centers down there. But it could go into, you know, along Algonquin.

So, you know, when we ever get three, hard to say, there's already quite a few out in this area, we already have one in south end of town, you know, we may or may not. We may get none, zero, in other areas in town. It remains to be seen. It will be regulated by the business license process. So, as long as there is only one in each of these areas, we would only approve one business license for adult use cannabis in, one in each of these three geographic regions if we get that many.

So, that's pretty much Staff's presentation. We're looking for, you know, feedback from the Plan Commission in amending Chapter 28 to allow adult use cannabis dispensaries in the B-2 and B-3 Zoning Districts as permitted, as of right, one in each of these three areas of town as defined in the ordinance that's proposed, as well as the permitted use table being updated, and the parking ratio for this type of uses at 100 to 200.

So, at that point, unless, Hart, did you have anything else you wanted to add?

MR. PASSMAN: Just some if I may clarifications as well. It's nice to see you all in person. When we see you it's on Zoom, so you're all more than floating heads and I appreciate that. I hope you're not surprised that as I am as well.

Correction though, there is a 1,000-foot regulation for advertising from schools, but the only distance requirement in state law is that two dispensaries cannot be within 1,500 feet of each other. That's the only, well, medical cannabis dispensaries have a totally different set of rules, and right now the Verilife dispensary has operated within those because it's a dual dispensary. But any new dispensaries that come in, presuming they will not be medical because that's a whole separate law, their only requirement will be 1,500 feet from one other. That includes an entity from ones that may be located in adjacent communities as well.

MR. ENRIGHT: Thank you for that clarification, that's important. You know, to that end, because we're only going to allow one in each of three geographic areas as proposed, it would be unlikely that we would, you know, we would be able to get the two within, you know, 1,500 feet, or if they were 1,500 feet away you wouldn't be able to have two because we're relegating it to one in each zone. You know, these zones are divided, so the likelihood of getting, you know, an abutting area with a commercial so you'd have one in one side of the street and one in the other like Hintz or Central is very unlikely.

So, I think these things would be spread out geographically, and that's kind of why we did it this way. They're not equidistant in terms of land areas, certainly the middle area is quite a bit larger than the north and the south. But our thinking was, you know, if there's one in the north, it would be up on, you know, probably Dundee. If there's one in the middle, it would be in that Rand Road corridor, and if there's one at the south, it would likely be on Golf or Algonquin. So, that would conclude Staff's presentation.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON WARSKOW: Okay, quick question. Was there public notices related to this? If so, were they given?

MR. ENRIGHT: Yes, public notices via an advertisement in the Daily Herald 15 days in advance of the meeting.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON WARSKOW: Do we have a motion to admit the

Staff report into the minutes?

COMMISSIONER DROST: I'll make that motion.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: I'll second.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON WARSKOW: Voice vote. All in favor?

(Chorus of ayes.)

ACTING CHAIRPERSON WARSKOW: So, do either one of our guests here this evening from the public want to speak to this matter?

(No response.)

ACTING CHAIRPERSON WARSKOW: No, all right.

So, let's start with our Commissioners. Jay, if you want to start us off?

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: Yes, I have a couple of questions, thanks, Chair Warskow.

A couple of things. Bill, thanks for your presentation. Can you, so we have these regions, and I read the minutes and it touched on a little bit of what was proposed, but this seems a bit odd that this would be, I mean, I don't know anything else that we have like that in our ordinance or maybe I'm wrong but, where we have a geographical breakdown that we limit. Is there a precedent for that, or that is --

MR. ENRIGHT: Not in Arlington Heights, no.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: Is that something that other municipalities with this issue are doing?

MR. ENRIGHT: I don't know if Hart Passman has any insight on that. I am not aware of how other communities, if they've been broken into zones, but Hart drafted the ordinance and, well, I'll let him give his opinion on the, you know, legal issues.

MR. PASSMAN: Commissioner Cherwin, what we're finding for communities that are approving adult use cannabis locations is that they're doing it one of two ways: either they're doing it by special use permit or they're doing something similar to this where they will allow them as permitted but restrict with some kind of registration program or geographic limitations. The statute does permit a limit on the number of dispensaries.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: And what's driving the, like municipalities to say, so one of the -- yes, I'm sorry, I'm all over the place, but I was surprised to see it permitted and not as a special use. So, my first thought would be, well, I'd probably like to see this as a special use because, very much like, I mean, when you ask for a drive-in even if it's Portillo's expanding their drive-in, right, that's like a special use permit, and to me, you know, you want to look at the dynamics of that particular area that it's mixed in. This would seem to me to be similar to that.

So, I guess one of my questions would be what are municipalities, how are they, why are they saying, well, we need to spread this out? Is there a reason for that?

MR. PASSMAN: I don't want to speak for any particular community. I think the logic behind the system is similar to this, if I can surmise a little bit based on my experience, is that the community has already decided that as a general rule it's going to be okay and just did not want it to go through special use hearings. Finding ways to limit location based on the specifics of the community zoning and development, and to that end limiting it, in our case the proposal is B-2 and B-3, so the concept --

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: Yes.

MR. PASSMAN: -- using Arlington Heights as an example only, the concept

is we know the zones to be generally like this. If there's one in the north and one in the south and one in the middle, these are the kind of zones where this use is allowed and that's sufficient along with the other operational requirements that they're required to abide by under state law.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: Yes, and I guess, and Hart, I appreciate that. I think for me it's probably less of a legal question and more of a policy question. I mean, if this is fine and everybody is okay with it and his could be a permitted use, why are we limiting the number of it? All that does is drive scarcity, and scarcity essentially creates a more expensive product and reduces competition. I think to myself, well, you know, we're not here to set policy of whether bringing this into the community is a smart thing. I mean, it seems to me that the Board has decided all of this is going to happen, if people are going to get high or buy weed, then we might as well make money off of it, that's kind of the position. So, I don't think from a policy perspective, we have, you know, that's not what we're addressing. But my thought is, well, if it's a good idea, if it's such a good idea, then why limit it? All we do then is just create a scarcity issue, it's not going to change how we address that. It will create some issues.

Bill, you had said something before about parking, well, not parking, but in the downtown you said, well, we wouldn't do this in the downtown for the mixed use of businesses there really driving it, and maybe there's parking issues in the downtown but I think you said really it's more primarily we wouldn't do it downtown because of the business mixes. I'm not sure if you can kind of elaborate on that for us.

MR. ENRIGHT: Well, that's not what I said. What I said is the mixed-use nature of downtown because of residential on top of a commercial, so I think from our opinion, this is not necessarily reflecting the Board, the Board has been pretty clear about not wanting it downtown for multiple reasons, parking and so forth. But from a land use standpoint, you know, I think that because you have residential right on top of commercial, it's different than living near a shopping center that's down the street. If you had a cannabis store, 4,500 square feet going into a 3,000 square-foot shopping center and you lived behind that shopping center, I think that's a lot different than living right above it. I think there's, you know, potentially concerns with that as well because you have the residential right on top of the commercial spaces.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: Well, yes, that's my issue is like I can see it from a parking perspective, and I live by the, you know, I live in the south end, it doesn't really bother me having it go in there. They seem to be doing a good use of parking. My wife can't stand it because she sees the security guards out there, the windows are blacked out, you know, all these people going for it. She doesn't even go to Jewel anymore. But for me, it's not a huge issue though, but I guess my thought is if it's not, you know, if it's not parking and it's not good enough to have the residences downtown being nearby, you know, you've got Jewel Center, we've got this right next door and right behind it, are there deleterious effects? You know, from this it sounds like if not, we haven't been, there's no reported increased crime in the south end of Arlington, that's what I'm understanding.

MR. ENRIGHT: Correct. I think it's perception, a lot of it.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: Yes. So, none of the neighbors or anything there have to say anything about it?

MR. ENRIGHT: No, I haven't heard of any complaints.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: Yes, I mean, that to me just seems, I would probably, and this is nothing against Hart, because I think the ordinance was really well drafted based on, I think the corrections you received, I just, I would probably see it as more of a special use permit rather than that.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON WARSKOW: Okay, thank you, Commissioner Cherwin. Sorry, didn't mean to refer to you just by your first name.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: Oh, no, I actually prefer being referred to by my first name.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON WARSKOW: Commissioner Sigalos?

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: I don't really have any other comments. I sat in on that Ordinance Review Committee, so I heard a lot of this discussion at that meeting and I really don't have anything further to add to it at this point in time.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: I also participated in the Ordinance Review Committee meeting, and I don't have a lot of questions. But Bill, you brought up one point this evening, that there hasn't been a major police activity in regard to the existing which for most of its time has been medical marijuana, right?

MR. ENRIGHT: Well, it's recently for, I think over, you know --

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Year and a half?

MR. ENRIGHT: A year, it's been adult use on a pilot program and there haven't been any issues with crime or theft or anything like that.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Nothing, no raised complaints or anything?

MR. ENRIGHT: Correct.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Okay, and then since this, any business that wants to come in to town and get approved, they're going to come through the permitting process, have to get a license. If they close their shop, the permit doesn't go with that, somebody new has to come in and reapply, correct?

MR. ENRIGHT: Well, I mean, they have to get a state license in order to operate, and then, so they get a conditional state license, and then apply for a business license from us. At that point, they have to have a location secured before they get their final state license. They have to be actually, you know, built out, the space that they're going in. If they close, they close. I mean, I'm pretty certain they're not transferable, so someone would have to, you know, have to have a new license and start from scratch.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Okay, that's all I have.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Yes, I'm sort of along the line of Commissioner Cherwin, Jay.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON WARSKOW: Okay.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Sort of from just an intuitive sense, this really follows more of a pattern of liquor stores, you know, the regulation of these three zones. A special use permit seems to me to be the right, the better way to approach it in the sense that when you have an operator, you know, who's gone through some of the layers, and there's no federal regulation in this, is there?

MR. PASSMAN: No. In fact, federal law still technically prohibits all of this which is an operational issue for dispensaries, but --

COMMISSIONER DROST: Yes, it's all --

MR. PASSMAN: -- it's not, there's no federal zoning.

COMMISSIONER DROST: All state, the state layered licensing, you know, basically you've got to, I guess finger printing and all the other steps that you would with a liquor license. So, I'm having, you know, sort of a, trying to look at this and separate it. Well, how is it still different than a liquor license? We probably spent more time on the puppy mills, you know, in trying to define what a puppy mill is and what not a puppy mill is. You've got these three zones,

it's almost like casino franchising. It's not, you know, the marketplace, you know, if they're doing a good job they're selling it, and they don't have any complaints, you know, the more revenue to the community the better and not to restrict it to these areas.

I think in the B-5, in the downtown area, I think that made some sense, you know, as far as the kind of restriction that you allow there. But why not all over? I mean, that's really the basic question and, more sort of a practical one, it gets away from a lot of the, sort of the farious rules to you could only have one in this location or one in this and then it can't be closer than 1,500 feet from each other. You know, it's bringing out the tape measure as opposed to using some common sense.

MR. ENRIGHT: Well, keep in mind, the state is only allowing a certain number of these dispensaries, period.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Yes.

MR. ENRIGHT: So, it isn't like any other use. It's heavily regulated and it's limited. So, what, you know, we're doing here, you know, we feel the direction that the Board gave us was pretty clear is that, you know, we want to limit it in town. We don't want, you know, an abundance of these. Having said that, I don't think you're going to get a bunch of these even if you didn't have zones because it's limited and there's already some around us that could close or more that could open. But even if we didn't have zones, I don't think, you know, you'd end up with the quantities, you know, just going to Arlington Heights anyway.

I think that the Board, as the elected representatives, want to just limit these and spread them out. Quite frankly, you know, I don't even know if we'll get three ever. So, we might but, you know, we'll see.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Yes, and it will be the operator who'll, you know, make it look like a candy store as opposed to some of the, you know, bad, brooding, dark Gotham City look. But it's just sort of wrangling with it and, you know, getting some of our constituents' or citizens' input and, you know, just some practical expense. Hart mentioned they're mostly experienced in communities that had started fast throughout the block and, you know, to what extent is this all to the whole fabric of the community to make these, not as strange, you know, it's like you've got Kryptonite you've got to put in a corner. That's the way I feel about this stuff, you know, rather than having this as a special use process.

Anyway, those are comments, you know, and I appreciate what you guys have done, you know, well, a heck of a lot more than, you know, myself. So, I'll just leave it at that, but that's the comment.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON WARSKOW: Commissioner Lorenzini, any comments?

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Yes, thank you.

On the same topic, I can see the logic behind spreading them out. I mean, I think at least will be palatable to some people in the community that have, you know, three schools that are only about 300 feet apart.

One thing I would say about Hintz Road, it's pretty far north, and say you've got something in the center, you've got something in the south end and you've got something in the center, and then somebody is looking for something at the north end, then it kind of limits their choice, you know, where they could go. I'm just afraid that you could potentially lose a third shot because the area they have to choose from is limited, but I mean, that's just my opinion. I think the overall concept of spreading them out is fine.

A couple of questions. I probably should know this, but adult use is

restricted to the home I assume?

MR. PASSMAN: Yes, under state law, and that's true of medical cannabis as well, state law does not authorize the public consumption of cannabis except in, you can have cannabis lounges, they're not operational in Illinois yet, so the law kind of lets that, but other than that, no.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: So as far as Illinois, a smoking room like they have with cigars is just --

MR. PASSMAN: At this time, no. That may be coming but it will be in designated areas.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: I also understand that there's different strengths of cannabis, is that an issue for the Village? Because a friend of mine works for the Illinois IRS and they're in charge of collecting taxes and there's more taxes on the higher strength cannabis than the lower strength cannabis and, you know, I'm just wondering if that's an issue for one store who only sell the higher strength stuff or whatever.

MR. ENRIGHT: I would assume it's a mix and, you know, medical sales, people with medical cards, I don't believe pay as much tax, you know, either. But that in and of itself is more of a state issue in how they regulate that versus a zoning issue for us.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: That's all I have, thank you.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON WARSKOW: Commissioner Green?

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Well, just to set your mind at ease, Joe, I'm north of Hintz and I'm just going to open one in my garage. Anyway --

MR. ENRIGHT: That would not be permitted.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: I suppose not, shucks, there you go. But I did, when I was cutting the grass in front of my house, I did clean up the trash that collects in the culvert and one of them was cannabis, little gummy bear things, an empty wrapper, so I have --

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Cutting the what?

COMMISSIONER GREEN: The grass. Ah!

COMMISSIONER DROST: The lawn.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: So, anyway, I guess there's a lot of products out there, but I was at the Ordinance Review and I think it's fine to limit this to the areas there. When we originally talked about this, I was a little bit concerned about competitions, and the more I think about it, you know, three zones, three shops, I'm good with that.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON WARSKOW: So, just a couple of quick questions. I know you said there hasn't been any, you know, police activity with the Verilife. How did the other shopping properties, you know, businesses, do they have any comments on having Verilife in the center with them?

MR. ENRIGHT: You know, I'm not aware of any complaints from adjoining businesses there. It's possible but not that I'm not that I'm aware of any.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON WARSKOW: Okay, and I can see, you know, both sides in this that we should probably let the market decide. You know, if there's a great demand in Arlington Heights, well, then, you know, there should be plenty of places to choose from. But I do understand that, like geographically, we're not creating a pocket in Arlington Heights so that the residents feel like they are in the cannabis section of town. So, like I said, I can see both sides to the issue. But overall, you know, I think it's fine to have the geographic areas.

Any other additional comments? Does anyone want to make a

motion then?

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: I'll make a motion.

A motion to recommend to the Village Board of Trustees approval of PC #22-005, Text Amendment to Chapter 28 related to adult use cannabis dispensaries.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: I'll second that.
ACTING CHAIRPERSON WARSKOW: All right, can we have a roll call?
MR. ENRIGHT: Certainly.
Commissioner Lorenzini.
COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Yes.
MR. ENRIGHT: Commissioner Green.
COMMISSIONER GREEN: Yes.
MR. ENRIGHT: Commissioner Drost.
COMMISSIONER DROST: Aye, with comment.
MR. ENRIGHT: Commissioner Ennes.
COMMISSIONER ENNES: Yes.
MR. ENRIGHT: Commissioner Sigalos.
COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: Yes.
MR. ENRIGHT: Commissioner Cherwin.
COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: No.
MR. ENRIGHT: And Chairman Warskow.
ACTING CHAIRPERSON WARSKOW: Yes.
Okay, you had a comment?
COMMISSIONER DROST: Yes, and it is basically conceptually you can live with it. It's not a 100 percent versus a zero, to treat this as evolutionary and then to review it from time to time to see how the marketplace is really responding and whether there are other communities or comparisons that you can make to best serve all the parties that might be affected by these new establishments.
ACTING CHAIRPERSON WARSKOW: All right then, is this slated for a particular Board meeting?
MR. ENRIGHT: Yes, scheduled for June 6th.
COMMISSIONER DROST: D-Day.
ACTING CHAIRPERSON WARSKOW: I'm sure that's why it was chosen.
COMMISSIONER DROST: Yes.
ACTING CHAIRPERSON WARSKOW: I don't think there's any other business before us tonight?
MR. ENRIGHT: There isn't.
ACTING CHAIRPERSON WARSKOW: So --
COMMISSIONER ENNES: Has a date been firmed up for the training session?
MR. ENRIGHT: No, we're still working on that unless you've --
MR. PASSMAN: I'm prepared to be here on the 8th, so unless --
MR. ENRIGHT: The 8th.
MR. PASSMAN: Yes.
MR. ENRIGHT: Wednesday the 8th.

DRAFT

MR. PASSMAN: Yes. I don't know if it's firm-firm, but I'm getting ready for it.
COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: What training was it?
COMMISSIONER ENNES: Commissioner training.
MR. PASSMAN: Commission training, both from, Staff from kind of a regulatory and then obviously some procedural and some new concepts.
ACTING CHAIRPERSON WARSKOW: Excellent.
MR. PASSMAN: Looking forward to it.
ACTING CHAIRPERSON WARSKOW: All right, do I have a motion to adjourn now?
COMMISSIONER DROST: I'll make that motion.
COMMISSIONER GREEN: I'll second.
ACTING CHAIRPERSON WARSKOW: All right, meeting is adjourned --
MR. PASSMAN: You need a vote.
ACTING CHAIRPERSON WARSKOW: Oh, voice vote. All in favor say aye?

(Chorus of ayes.)

ACTING CHAIRPERSON WARSKOW: All right, meeting adjourned.

(Whereupon, at 8:01 p.m., the above-mentioned petition meeting was adjourned.)

DRAFT

STATE OF ILLINOIS)
) SS.
COUNTY OF KANE)

I, RONALD LeGRAND, JR., depose and say that I am a digital court reporter doing business in the State of Illinois; that I reported verbatim the foregoing proceedings and that the foregoing is a true and correct transcript to the best of my knowledge and ability.

_____
RONALD LeGRAND, JR.

SUBSCRIBED AND SWORN TO

BEFORE ME THIS _____ DAY OF

_____, A.D. 2022.

_____
NOTARY PUBLIC

DRAFT