



**MINUTES
VILLAGE OF GLENCOE
ZONING COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING**

Village Hall Council Chamber
675 Village Court
Monday, October 7, 2019 - 7:30 PM

1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

The Regular Meeting of the Commission of the Village of Glencoe was called to order by the Chair, at 7:30 p.m. on the 7th day of October 2019, in the Village Hall Council Chamber.

Attendee Name	Title	Status
Zoning Commission		
Howard Roin	Chair	Present
Deborah Carlson	Member	Present
Sara Elsasser	Member	Present
David Friedman	Member	Absent
Alex Kaplan	Member	Present
John Satter	Member	Present
Scott Novack	Member	Present
Village Staff		
Sharon Tanner	Assistant Village Manager	Present
Philip Kiraly	Village Manager	Present
Stewart Weiss	Village Attorney	Present
Lee Brown	Village Planning Consultant	Present
Richard McGowan	Planner	Present

2. APPROVE TELECONFERENCE ATTENDANCE OF DEBORAH CARLSON

RESULT:	ACCEPTED [UNANIMOUS]
AYES:	Roin, Elsasser, Kaplan, Satter, Novack
NAYS:	None
ABSENT:	Friedman

3. PUBLIC COMMENT

Chair Howard Roin asked the audience if anyone had a public comment other than business related to the scheduled agenda item regarding cannabis business establishments. No comments were made.

4. REFERRAL AND REQUEST FOR RECOMMENDATION FROM THE VILLAGE BOARD OF TRUSTEES

The Village Board of Trustees requests a public hearing before the Zoning Commission to consider amendments to the Glencoe Zoning Code to accommodate and regulate Cannabis Business Establishments, and to make a recommendation thereto.

Earlier this year, the Cannabis Regulation and Tax Act (the “Act”) was signed into State law. Under the Act, effective January 1, 2020, adults age 21 and older may lawfully purchase cannabis products from licensed dispensaries for recreational use. The Act authorizes municipalities to allow or prohibit the operation of recreational (also known as “adult-use”) cannabis businesses within their boundaries and to implement local zoning regulations related to recreational cannabis businesses.

In June 2019, the Village Board passed a “red flag” resolution directing the Zoning Commission to conduct a public hearing on proposed amendments to the Village’s Zoning Code regarding the appropriate zoning and regulation of Cannabis Business Establishments. After discussing potential benefits and challenges related to allowing the cultivation, processing, and/or sale of cannabis for recreational purposes at the August 15, 2019 Committee of the Whole meeting, the Village Board directed Village staff to prepare conceptual zoning regulations for recreational Cannabis Business Establishments within the Village. The Village Board discussed the conceptual zoning regulations at the September 12, 2019 Committee of the Whole meeting and provided feedback for the Zoning Commission to consider during the public hearing process.

The Village Board is considering whether to authorize Cannabis Business Establishments in Glencoe and has asked the Zoning Commission to advise concerning the zoning and regulation of such businesses if the Village Board decides to authorize them. Specifically, the Zoning Commission is asked to consider the following:

1. In which zoning district(s), if any, are recreational Cannabis Business Establishments compatible, either as permitted uses or special uses?
2. What conditions or restrictions should be imposed on recreational Cannabis Business Establishments, if they are ultimately allowed by the Village Board?

SUMMARY OF TESTIMONY

Chair Roin thanked members of the audience for attending and briefly explained the purpose of tonight’s meeting and outlined the agenda. Chair Roin noted that public comments will be limited to three minutes, and a representative of a group is able to have six minutes. He then invited Village staff to begin their presentation.

Assistant Village Manager Sharon Tanner outlined that the purpose of tonight’s meeting is to discuss potential zoning regulations for Cannabis Business Establishments (“CBEs”), should they ultimately be allowed to operate within the Village of Glencoe. She summarized that the staff presentation would review the referral and request for recommendation that was made by the Village Board to the Zoning Commission and that Village Attorney Stewart Weiss would provide a brief overview of the Illinois Cannabis Regulation and Tax Act (CRTA), the State law legalizing the possession, use, and purchase of cannabis products by individuals 21 years of age and older in the State of Illinois starting January 1, 2020.

Assistant Village Manager Tanner then clarified that the presentation would focus on municipal regulation and zoning authority, as well as State regulatory authority that has been established under the Act, and that Village Staff will provide an overview of the Village Board's feedback following their initial discussions on the matter. Additionally, Ms. Tanner stated that Village Staff will provide a summary of draft Zoning Code amendments to aid in the Zoning Commission's discussion this evening, and ultimately in the Zoning Commission's development of a recommendation to the Village Board regarding Zoning Code regulations, should the Village Board ultimately decide to allow CBEs to operate within the Village of Glencoe.

Attorney Weiss stated that the Village Board has held a series of discussions at several Committee of the Whole meetings about the Cannabis Regulation and Tax Act and municipal regulatory authority. He then clarified that the Village Board made the referral to the Zoning Commission, and that typically when a zoning code amendment comes before the Zoning Commission, it is usually a private party that is requesting that the zoning code be changed, but in this case the applicant is the Village Board. Attorney Weiss stated that the Village Board has asked the Zoning Commission to determine, how should CBEs be regulated from a land use and zoning perspective if the Village Board decides to allow them in the Village

Attorney Weiss clarified that tonight the decision will not be whether cannabis businesses should be allowed, as the Village Board has indicated only a preliminary openness to that decision, but rather if cannabis businesses are allowed, the Zoning Commission is asked to make recommendations as to how they will be regulated with respect to zoning.

Attorney Weiss explained the Zoning Commission's process of conducting a public hearing and formulating a recommendation for the Village Board. Attorney Weiss clarified that the Zoning Commission will vote on any recommendation(s) to be made to the Village Board, as the Village Board is the only body that can amend the zoning code. Attorney Weiss stated that the record that is created at the public hearing by those who have submitted letters, signed petitions, and those who are speaking tonight will be transmitted to the Village Board to consider, in addition to the Zoning Commission's recommendations.

Attorney Weiss summarized the Cannabis Regulation and Tax Act, stating that it will become effective January 1, 2020, and it will allow purchase, possession, and use of recreational cannabis by adults, which is not a question that is before any local board, and that no Village can prohibit people over the age of 21 from possession cannabis in general. The Cannabis Regulation and Tax Act will also allow consumption by adults on private property, and there will be a State licensure of recreational cannabis dispensaries, cultivation centers, and related businesses.

Attorney Weiss explained that municipalities have authority to allow or prohibit CBEs within their boundaries, and if allowed, impose zoning regulations for the location and operation of CBEs.

Attorney Weiss summarized that the Cannabis Regulation and Tax Act prohibits consumption of cannabis in public places, including on school grounds, in close proximity to minors or in any place where smoking is prohibited under the Smoke Free Illinois Act, and he clarified that this is actually more restrictive than what is required of alcohol, but it is a similar model. He went on to explain that sale and consumption of cannabis to minors under 21 is prohibited, with the exception of lawful medical patients. Home delivery, drive-throughs, driving under the influence, and possession of cannabis in a motor vehicle are also prohibited, unless the cannabis is in a sealed, odor-proof, tamper-evident, child-resistant, and reasonably inaccessible container.

Attorney Weiss stated that municipalities have authority to prohibit recreational CBEs; municipalities can regulate the time, place, manner, and number of CBEs that may operate within their boundaries; and that municipalities can determine the types of CBEs that may operate in the community, such as cultivation centers, craft growers, dispensaries and other ancillary businesses. He said that municipalities can require CBEs to obtain special use permits, which require review by the Zoning Commission and Village Board. The Village Board would have the authority to include additional regulations and restrictions through the Special Use process.

Attorney Weiss explained separation/distance requirements from other land uses. He stated that State law requires at least 1,500 feet between dispensaries, and that municipalities can impose larger distance requirements. He explained that municipalities may require CBEs to undergo or be subject to appearance review, signage review, parking standards and all other parts of the zoning review process that normally apply to special uses. He explained that the State of Illinois is the sole licenser of the existing 56 dispensaries and the approximately 20 to 21 cultivation centers that are operating in Illinois under the medical cannabis program.

Assistant Village Manager Tanner stated that the Village Board has held initial discussions on the topic of CBEs dating back to March 2019 when the State law was still in draft form. The Village Board received a presentation of the bill that eventually became State law after some modifications were made. In June 2019, the Village Board passed a "red flag" resolution that directed a process for Zoning Code amendments to be considered, should the Village ultimately allow CBEs to operate within the Village, which lead to the hearing this evening. The Village Board discussed the topic of CBEs generally at their August and September Committee of the Whole meetings this year.

Assistant Village Manager Tanner reiterated that after the Zoning Commission concludes its discussion, it will make a recommendation to the Village Board regarding potential zoning regulations for CBEs, should the Village ultimately allow CBEs to operate within the Village. She stated that the Village Board will make a policy decision whether to allow or prohibit CBEs, and if they are allowed, under what zoning regulations. Assistant Village Manager Tanner clarified that the Village does not have to conclude its discussion by January 1, 2020, and that the staff anticipates discussions could continue until early next year. Assistant Village Manager Tanner reviewed staff's recommendations for the Zoning Commission. She explained that if the Zoning Commission desires to adhere to the Village Board's guidance regarding location of cannabis businesses and special use permit requirement, staff recommends that the Zoning Code be amended to identify CBEs as special uses in both the B-2 Neighborhood Shopping District and the HF Highway Frontage District, both of which are designated for commercial uses. Assistant Village Manager Tanner further explained what may be applicable in the existing Zoning Code and a staff recommendation to the Zoning Commission to consider whether permitting CBEs would require zoning code amendments and/or require applicants to go through a special use permitting process. The potential Zoning Code amendments and/or special use permitting process would potentially address several elements such as the hours of operation, building appearance, off-street parking requirements, a fully-enclosed loading dock, shared-wall environments, lighting, security, signage and other operational requirements.

Assistant Village Manager Tanner noted that the Village Board's initial feedback was regarding cannabis businesses as special uses. She explained that permitted uses are allowed by right within a zoning district, provided that the use meets all applicable requirements in the Village Code, and a Special use is a land use that is generally considered compatible with other land uses in the zoning district, but requires additional review. The Village Board expressed interest in requiring special use permits for all classes of CBEs and expressed that the Village Board can limit the number of special use permits that are issued, and that special use permits require additional steps, such as approval from the Village Board. She then

confirmed that the staff recommendation would be to require special use permit for Cannabis Business Establishments.

Assistant Village Manager Tanner said that staff also recommends that the Zoning Code be amended to include several new definitions, one of which would potentially incorporate a collective definition for “Cannabis Business Establishments” that includes cannabis dispensaries, cannabis infusers, cannabis processors and cannabis craft growers. She continued the conversation regarding Zoning Code definitions, and stated that staff recommends that the Zoning Code be amended to delete the existing definition of “Medical Cannabis Dispensary” and references to medical cannabis dispensaries, and replace those with a single definition of “Cannabis Dispensary” that includes dispensaries serving both recreational/adult-use customers and registered qualifying medical patients, in any zoning districts where CBEs are permitted. She explained that by creating a unified definition for dispensaries, businesses serving the recreational and medical markets will be regulated consistently, and that the Village of Glencoe expects that all new dispensaries that will be licensed by the State going forward will be primarily focused on the residential market. Assistant Village Manager Tanner then explained that if the Zoning Commission wishes to recommend separation/distance requirements for CBEs, staff recommends the following:

- B-2 District: All CBEs would be required to obtain a special use permit and comply with a minimum separation/distance requirement of at least 500 feet from the property line of any pre-existing public or private elementary school or day care center, day care home, group day care home or part-day child care facility. This separation requirement would allow all existing parcels in the B-2 District to accommodate an adult-use CBE.
- HF District: All CBEs would be required to obtain a special use permit, and no minimum separation/distance would be recommended due to natural buffers that exist in the HF District.

Assistant Village Manager Tanner stated that staff requests that the Zoning Commission recommend as part of its deliberations the appropriate separation requirements from sensitive uses. She then noted that if the Zoning Commission opts to recommend a greater distance requirement than 500 feet, some or all the parcels in the B-2 District would not be available for use by a CBE. Additionally, Ms. Tanner noted that staff did not incorporate separation/distance requirements from sensitive uses in the HF District, as the Highway Frontage District has natural buffers such as a 200-foot-wide ComEd right-of-way to the east and the Edens Expressway to the west.

Assistant Village Manager Tanner then presented several maps of the Village’s B-1, B-2, and HF zoning districts. The maps also depicted “restricted areas” and their proximity to sensitive uses with separations ranging from 250 feet to 1,000 feet. She then explained signage, imagery and advertising components of the State law, such as images of a cannabis leaf or therapeutic claims.

Chair Howard Roin then asked for clarification of the distance between sensitive uses and commercial properties in the B-1 District. Attorney Weiss answered that it is approximately 250 feet between the closest parcels in the B-1 District to Central School.

Chair Roin asked if there are any parcels in the B-1 District that are 500 feet away from a sensitive use. Village Planner Lee Brown confirmed that parcels on Village Court are at least 500 feet from a sensitive use.

Chair Roin then asked for clarification on the impact a newly established sensitive use would have on a pre-existing, lawfully established CBE; specifically, if a new sensitive use begins operating in a zoning district near a CBE, how would the CBE special use be treated. Attorney Weiss then briefly explained that

the use would be allowed to continue as a pre-existing non-conforming use, unless the use has ceased operations for a certain period of time.

Commissioner Satter then clarified the Zoning Commission's recommendations are advisory and then asked if it would be possible for an applicant to seek a variance as part of the special use process. Attorney Weiss responded that the Village only allows variances that are permitted, and that the Village's Zoning Code does not allow variances from the requirements of a special use ordinance.

Commissioner Satter then asked Attorney Weiss about the 1,000-foot separation requirement from sensitive uses for medical cannabis dispensaries. Mr. Weiss confirmed that the 1,000-foot separation requirement has been removed from the State law regarding medical cannabis. However, the Act provides that municipalities have a great deal of leeway in defining not only what is an appropriate separation/distance requirement from sensitive uses, but also to define what constitutes a sensitive use. Attorney Weiss said that if any distance requirements are established, the staff recommends that they be applied in a uniform manner, rather than on a case-by-case basis.

Commissioner Satter then mentioned that he did not find any language requiring parks as sensitive uses in the materials that the Zoning Commission members received and Attorney Weiss confirmed that parks were not included in the list of sensitive uses, but could be added into the definition. Assistant Village Manager Tanner confirmed that parks are not included in the maps with proximities to sensitive uses.

Commissioner Novack asked about potential limits on the number of special use permits, and noted that it may not be possible to have more than one CBE in each zoning district, due to the State law requiring at least 1,500 feet between cannabis dispensaries.

Chair Roin then asked if there were any additional questions from the Zoning Commission. With no additional questions, Chair Roin then opened the public comment portion of the public hearing.

- Karen Citow, 81 Lakewood Drive, Glencoe, stated that she is alarmed and that this is the first time that the Zoning Commission has asked for any public feedback on this topic. She then stated that the State of Illinois is the first to legalize marijuana via legislation and not ballot initiative, and that there was legislation forced down the throats of people that do not agree with the legalization of marijuana. She expressed concerns over public safety, tax money, the message this will send to our children, and devastation to families. She mentioned that the President of the Village of Winnetka was not in favor of dispensaries in the Village of Glencoe. She said that Glencoe should join neighboring communities in prohibiting cannabis businesses.
- Myles Mendoza, 756 Glencoe Drive, Glencoe, asked if there is an option for the Zoning Commission to recommend prohibiting zoning regulations that would allow cannabis sales within the Village entirely. Chair Roin noted that that is not what the Zoning Commission has been asked to evaluate. Mr. Mendoza expressed concern that cannabis users will waft their smoke on other people and his concern about the impacts on property values. He then concluded that it does not feel like there is a lot of transparency in this process.
- Jessica Tucker, Winnetka resident and former Village President of Winnetka, thanked the Village of Glencoe for inviting Winnetka residents to the public hearing. She stated that there should be caution before recommendations to the Village Board and that if the Zoning Commission does recommend allowing CBEs in individual zoning districts, then to not recommend allowing CBEs in the Hubbard Woods Plaza area due to the sensitive uses nearby.

- Stefanie Boron, 1065 Julia Court, Glencoe, stated she does not see the need to rush this process and be on the cutting edge. She mentioned that 70% of municipalities in Colorado have decided not to allow dispensaries, and that any business that goes into the former Walgreens location will give Glencoe tax revenue. She agrees that the Hubbard Woods Plaza is not an appropriate location for a dispensary due to the proximity to sensitive uses. She stated that there is a petition which has 109 signatures of residents which she sent to the Village Board. She suggested a referendum vote or something similar.
- Jerry Leikin, 1037 Edgebrook Lane, Glencoe stated that he is on the State Board of Health and works with the poison center, and clarified that he is not representing these entities before the Zoning Commission. He described pulmonary issues due to vaping that are occurring in the North Shore hospital region. He stated that Evanston is experiencing one case a month due to the vaping of cannabis. He also mentioned that poison centers across the country are getting thousands of calls due to cannabis and that government bodies should not promote psychogenic drugs to the adolescence in unlimited doses. He also stated that cannabis is not alcohol and that there is nothing in the law about quality control, and that kids could be smoking pesticides in cannabis because there is no pesticide analysis. Lastly, he expressed concerns about medical consequences of cannabis.
- Steven Buckman, 199 Hazel Avenue, Glencoe asked if this matter will be part of a ballot initiative in March or November of 2020. He also asked which surrounding communities are allowing CBEs. Attorney Weiss answered Mr. Buckman and stated that Northbrook is currently undergoing a similar public hearing process, and if cannabis businesses are decided to be allowed in Northbrook, the Northbrook Village Board may consider a special use permit requirement. Mr. Buckman continued, asking if Public Safety has done an analysis as to whether there will be any additional requirements for Public Safety if Glencoe decides to add their own dispensary. He then stated that perhaps more information is needed on this matter.
- Vera Mullerbergh, 246 Dennis Lane, Glencoe, believes that this is by far the most controversial issue that has come before the Commission. He stated that he believes the health issue that is confronting our next generation is very serious and that there is a lot of information on the internet regarding the health consequences of smoking cannabis. He opposed amending the Zoning Code to allow CBEs, stating that the future of our children is at stake and the drug should be forbidden.
- JD Burns, 1519 Tower Road, Winnetka, and current school board president of Sacred Heart School, stated that he is not representing Sacred Heart School, but is speaking as a parent and neighbor. He is concerned with the B-2 Zoning District and asked for a clarification for the proximity of CBEs to sensitive uses. Chair Roin confirmed that the Zoning Commission is considering the proximities to sensitive uses tonight. Mr. Burns continued, stating that he would prefer greater separation requirements and that he found it odd that there is a strict requirement regarding a dispensary's proximity to another dispensary, but flexibility for a dispensary in proximity to sensitive uses. He asked that the Zoning Commission give serious consideration as to what the minimum distance is for a dispensary to a sensitive use. He prefers that CBEs not be allowed in the B-2 District; however, if they are allowed, he prefers the 1,000-foot separation requirement.
- John Lyons, 476 Woodlawn Avenue, Glencoe, expressed concern about public safety. He stated he does not see how a dispensary is going to help the image of Glencoe as a family community and has a huge objection of allowing dispensaries in the Village.
- Alex Sokol, 270 Wentworth Avenue, Glencoe, stated that he senses a lot of hysteria over what the possible negative outcomes would be for allowing a dispensary in the Village. He mentioned that he has family members who have medical conditions that require medical marijuana and that local dispensaries would be convenient for his family members, other medical patients and adults that

would like to responsibly use cannabis for their personal enjoyment. He stated that the B-2 District has a large Binny's Beverage Depot. He stated that the idea that people blow smoke at other people misses the point that the law would not allow for consumption in public. He mentioned it is important to be open to the public, get public input and consider a long-term plan.

- Kevin Campbell, a Highland Park resident and Glencoe commercial property owner in the B-1 District, stated that he has worked with the Village on several issues and topics and that the Village has always been very helpful. He mentioned that told a business tenant that he would not consider a cannabis business in one of his properties, and that he does not think CBEs are appropriate for Glencoe.
- Ryan Cole, 422 Adams Avenue, Glencoe quoted a *Pioneer Press* newspaper article in which the Wilmette Police Chief and Glencoe Deputy Chief Richard Weiner were quoted on the impact of marijuana legalization on the community. Mr. Cole stated that he hopes the Zoning Commission listens to the experts.
- Dieter Schmitz, 69 Lakewood Drive, Glencoe stated that he is a longtime Glencoe resident is very much opposed to cannabis businesses in Glencoe. He is concerned with the safety of the children and prefers to prohibit cannabis businesses in Glencoe.
- Mike Rosenthal, 350 Jackson Avenue, Glencoe, thanked the Zoning Commission and audience for attending the meeting. He said several subject matters which previously came before the Village were denied because residents wanted to maintain the character of Glencoe. He asked the Zoning Commission to recommend not allowing CBEs in Glencoe.
- Tim Dracoff, a resident of Northfield who grew up in Glencoe, stated that if the Zoning Commission recommends anything less than a 1,000-foot separation between a dispensary and sensitive use, it would be an irresponsible act. He also asked that the Zoning Commission consider the volume of people that a CBE would bring into the Village, with a very large demand and limited supply. He then concluded that if the Village of Glencoe does consider allowing CBEs, it makes far more sense for CBEs to be in the HF District near the car dealerships than in Hubbard Woods.
- Stanley Nitzberg, 169 Lake Street, Glencoe, requested that the Zoning Commission consider expanding the sensitive uses to include parks and child-centric businesses. He said he has never seen someone in Glencoe drinking alcohol out of a brown bag, but cannabis provides a different opportunity relative to the public experience. He stated that if the Zoning Commission is going to recommend allowing CBEs in any zoning district, then it should be recommended in all commercial zoning districts; and that if CBEs should not be allowed in the downtown business district, they should not be allowed in the B-2 District due to sensitive uses in that area. Chair Roin then asked Mr. Nitzberg if he would support with allowing CBEs in the downtown. Mr. Nitzberg responded that he is trying to make a point to not pick specific areas in the Village. Mr. Nitzberg confirmed that he does not want cannabis businesses in Glencoe. He then asked when the Village Board will consider CBEs. Village Manager Kiraly stated that the soonest the Village Board would discuss CBEs would be the November Village Board meeting.
- David Roberts, a Winnetka resident, stated that he does not support CBEs on the North Shore. He hopes Glencoe will follow Winnetka's lead on this and will not expose the children to this. He mentioned that the two communities share a lot of the same values and that he is surprised it has come to such a discussion in Glencoe. He said that it would be helpful to draw heat maps around the sensitive uses and some of the parks, and that allowing CBEs near the Edens Expressway is different than allowing them near Hubbard Woods. He stated that there has been an increase in traffic

fatalities in states that have legalized marijuana, so there is a trade-off. He confirmed that he does not want cannabis businesses in the B-2 District.

- Nicole Roberts, a Winnetka resident, stated that her child attends Kid Motion at Hubbard Woods Plaza, and then told the Zoning Commission to not let opening the pot shop be their legacy.
- Nadia Cobalovic, 175 Lake Street, Glencoe, stated that Evanston is considering separation requirements of 750 feet between cannabis businesses and sensitive uses; 1,000 feet from schools and 500 feet from parks in Niles, 1,000 feet from schools and parks in Skokie; Chicago and Deerfield will require 500 feet from parks and 1,000 feet from schools. She questioned why Glencoe would be less restrictive for proximity to sensitive uses than some of the other surrounding communities. She said that we know about the tax revenue, but there are unknowns such as impacts to the community.
- Andy Bullock, 444 Drexel Avenue, Glencoe, stated that he and his family are completely opposed to cannabis. He thanked the Zoning Commission for their time and stated that medical and recreational uses should not be linked. He asked that Glencoe consider codifying a requirement consistent with the Cannabis Regulation and Tax Act that requires a buffer of at least 1,500 feet between cannabis dispensaries. He also requested that parks be included in the list of sensitive uses.
- Cecilia Melotti, a Winnetka resident, stated that some of the marijuana edibles are lollipops, which she believes are meant to attract children. She warned of the dangers of marijuana edibles, and that people will eat them until they overdose.
- Vivian Nitzberg, 169 Lake Street, Glencoe, said that she recommends that the Zoning Commission table this discussion and to not move quickly in making a decision.

This concluded public comment.

Commissioner Kaplan asked Village Attorney Stewart Weiss if the Zoning Commission has the authority to not recommend amending the Zoning Code to include cannabis dispensaries. Attorney Weiss confirmed the Zoning Commission does have such authority. Attorney Weiss noted that if the code remains as it is, then medical cannabis dispensaries will still be permitted because they must be permitted by State law.

Commissioner Kaplan then asked if staff is aware of any studies of the impacts of cannabis dispensaries on property values. Attorney Weiss responded that there have been some informal studies and that in places where legalization has occurred, little property value depreciation has occurred. He noted that real estate markets in Illinois is different than other states and it is difficult to compare.

Chair Roin reiterated that the Zoning Commission has been asked to recommend how to zone CBEs, if they are allowed in Glencoe, and stated that residents will continue to be notified of public meetings. He recommended allowing CBEs in the B-1 District, to treat all potential areas of the Village equally. Chair Roin and Commissioner Novack each stated that the Zoning Commission should recommend a single definition of "cannabis dispensary," and the Zoning Commission concurred.

Commissioner Novack asked if there was an issue with the loading docks and amount of physical space in the B-1 District. Attorney Weiss stated that current interpretation of the State law indicates that it does not require fully-enclosed loading docks; however, they could be required as part of a local ordinance.

Commissioner Satter stated that the initial setbacks set by the State should be a minimum that the Zoning Commission considers, in addition to including parks with the list of sensitive uses. He also mentioned

that a cannabis dispensary may also result in a migration of businesses in the B-2 District, and that if Glencoe does allow a dispensary, the HF District is more sensible.

Commissioner Kaplan asked if the Village is aware of the tangible, financial, economic, social and spiritual benefits of happening a dispensary in Glencoe. Attorney Weiss responded that those are policy questions.

Commissioner Novack and Attorney Weiss then briefly discussed potential tax revenues. Commissioner Novack thanked the audience for attending the meeting. He stated that he does not agree with most of what he has heard tonight, such as the hysteria and hypothetical scenarios. He said that cannabis is now becoming a mature and highly-regulated industry. He compared the hysteria to the prohibition era, and that now liquor stores are so common that they are allowed even closer to schools. He acknowledged that comments from Sacred Heart School are well-heard and respected. He stated that he respects everyone's opinions and that discussion about proximity of CBEs and sensitive uses is worthwhile.

Commissioner Elsasser agreed with Commissioner Novack that the Zoning Commission should further discuss proximities to sensitive uses. She stated that the HF District may be the more appropriate option, rather than including the B-1 District as Chair Roin mentioned.

Commissioner Carlson questioned considering CBEs in the B-1 and B-2 Districts when the HF District is an option.

Chair Roin mentioned that he does not believe allowing a cannabis business in the B-1 or B-2 Districts would destroy lives, but he strongly respects everyone's opinions.

Attorney Weiss then initiated an informal poll of the Commission regarding the three available commercial zoning districts: B-1, B-2, and HF. Commissioner Satter and Commissioner Carlson indicated preference for considering only the HF District. Chair Roin and Commissioner Novack indicated preference for considering all three zoning commercial districts. Commissioner Elsasser indicated preference for continuing the discussion. Commissioner Kaplan indicated preference for not allowing CBEs in any commercial zoning district.

Chair Roin said that the most suitable option moving forward may be requiring a special use permit, which requires additional public hearings and allows for the flexibility to deny a cannabis business.

Attorney Weiss summarized that there is a consensus of at least four votes that wherever a cannabis business would potentially be permitted, that it would be considered an allowable special use to open and operate.

The Commission agreed that the duration of a special use permit should be the duration of the property lease, which gives the owner some control over the special use.

Attorney Weiss clarified that the Commission's consensus was that if CBEs are allowed in the HF District, then there would not be a distance requirement; if CBEs are allowed in the B-1 or B-2 Districts, there is not a consensus among the Commissioners on a recommendation regarding proximity to sensitive uses.

Commissioner Carlson reiterated that the Village should not allow a CBE in the B-1 or B-2 Districts. She suggested allowing only in the HF District.

The Zoning Commission members agreed that they do not need to recommend amending the Zoning Code regarding CBE operational requirements such as business hours, signage, security, loading docks and off-street parking due to the requirements of the special use process.

Village Planner Brown asked for clarification as to whether the Zoning Commission will recommend that parks be included in the list of sensitive uses.

Attorney Weiss stated that the Zoning Commission came to a consensus that parks should be included in the list of sensitive uses, but there were diverse views regarding appropriate distance requirements from sensitive uses.

Attorney Weiss noted that there is a motion to recommend staff's recommendations with the following modifications:

- Subject to distance requirements, CBEs would be included in the B-1, B-2, and HF Districts, and the distance requirements may preclude cannabis businesses.
- CBEs would require a special use, which would require individual applicants to come back in before the Board as part of a public hearing process.
- On-premises consumption of cannabis would be prohibited.
- There would be a single definition of "cannabis dispensary" for dispensaries serving the recreational and/or medical markets.
- For distance requirements, there would be no less than 500 feet requirement from sensitive uses, which shall include the sensitive uses listed in the Village Staff report and shall also include public parks in the definition of "sensitive use." There is no recommendation on the business hours of operation, which would be handled on a case-by-case basis as part of the special use process.
- Parking requirements would comply with either normal commercial parking requirements or be handled via special use.

Commissioner Novack made a motion to accept staff's recommendations as it pertains to sections that are not separation and distance requirements, and to allow cannabis sales in the HF District without a requirement on a separation distance. Commissioner Elsasser seconded the motion. In his motion, Commissioner Novack clarified that examples of the recommendations not related to separation and distance requirements are handling parking requirements in the special use process and hours of operation in the special use process.

5. MOTION TO ACCEPT STAFF'S RECOMMENDATIONS NOT PERTAINING TO SEPARATION AND DISTANCE REQUIREMENTS AND TO RECOMMEND ALLOWING CANNABIS SALES IN THE HF DISTRICT WITHOUT A SEPARATION REQUIREMENT FROM SENSITIVE USES

RESULT:	ACCEPTED
AYES:	Roin, Carlson, Elsasser, Satter, Novack
NAYS:	Kaplan
ABSENT:	Friedman

Commissioner Novack made a motion to follow staff's recommendation to allow CBEs the B-2 District and require a separation distance requirement of at least 500 feet from sensitive uses, including parks. Commissioner Elsasser seconded the motion.

6. MOTION TO RECOMMEND ALLOWING CANNABIS BUSINESSES IN THE B-2 DISTRICT WITH A SEPARATION DISTANCE REQUIREMENT OF 500 FEET FROM SENSITIVE USES, INCLUDING PARKS

RESULT:	MOTION FAILS
AYES:	Roin, Elsasser, Novack
NAYS:	Carlson, Kaplan, Satter
ABSENT:	Friedman

Commissioner Novack made a motion to recommend allowing CBEs in the B-1 District and require a separation requirement of at least 500 feet from sensitive uses, including parks. Commissioner Elsasser seconded the motion.

7. MOTION TO RECOMMEND ALLOWING CANNABIS BUSINESSES IN THE B-1 DISTRICT WITH A SEPARATION DISTANCE REQUIREMENT OF 500 FEET FROM SENSITIVE USES, INCLUDING PARKS

RESULT:	MOTION FAILS
AYES:	Roin, Elsasser, Novack
NAYS:	Carlson, Kaplan, Satter
ABSENT:	Friedman

Chair Roin indicated these recommendations would be shared with the Village Board for its consideration.

There being no further business to come before the Zoning Commission, Commissioner Satter made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Commissioner Kaplan seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously. the meeting was adjourned at 10:27 p.m.