



Village of Bartlett  
Planning and Zoning Commission  
July 7, 2022

---

**M. Werden**, Chair called the meeting to order at 7:00 pm.

**Roll Call**

**Present:** B. Bucaro, C. Deveaux, M. Hopkins, J. Kapadoukakis, G. Koziol, J. Miaso, M. Werden  
**Absent:** S. Callahan, M. Sarwas

**Also Present:** Kristy Stone, Interim Planning & Development Services Director, Devin Kamperschroer, Associate Planner

**Approval of Minutes**

A motion was made to approve the June 2, 2022 meeting minutes.

**Motioned by:** G. Koziol  
**Seconded by:** C. Deveaux

**Roll Call**

**Ayes:** B. Bucaro, C. Deveaux, M. Hopkins, J. Kapadoukakis, G. Koziol, M. Werden  
**Nays:** None  
**Abstain:** None

The motion carried.

**M. Werden** please note for the record that **J. Miaso** did arrive at 7:04 and is in attendance.



Village of Bartlett  
Planning and Zoning Commission  
July 7, 2022

---

**(#22-10) 1277 Keim Trail  
PUBLIC HEARING**

**The following exhibits were presented:**

**Exhibit A – Picture of Sign**

**Exhibit B – Mail Affidavit**

**Exhibit C – Notification of Publication**

The petitioners, **Kristen Wolf of 118 Waterbury Circle, Schaumburg** and **Tom Class** came forward and were sworn in by the chairman, **M. Werden**. **T. Class** stated that they are asking for a variance from the 30-foot building separation requirement. To get the area that we are looking for, we would have to push the house back 15 feet and would be in the retention area. **K. Wolf** the front of the proposed house would match the other houses on the street. **K. Stone** this lot is located in the Durwood Forest subdivision, which is zoned ER-3 PUD. If it was zoned ER-3 the minimum setback would be 15 feet for each lot. The original developer wanted to have flexibility and now the minimum setback is 7-1/2 feet, but there needs to be 30-feet between the houses. **T. Class** we are asking for the variance for the side yards because the two neighbors on each side built so close to our lot lines. **M. Hopkins** were you aware of these restrictions when you bought the lot? **T. Class** no. **M. Hopkins** how did you come to understand the restrictions? **K. Wolf** when we started the permitting process and had our architectural drawings done. **T. Class** the value of the proposed home would be equal to or greater than the homes around it. It will not be over built or under built. **M. Hopkins** has anyone contacted staff about this? **D. Kamperschroer** two neighbors stopped in to ask about the variation and spoke against it. **K. Wolf** I guess the alternative is for the neighbors to stare at an empty lot. **J. Miaso** where is the retention area? **T. Class** it is in the back of the property and there is an easement. **D. Kamperschroer** there is a 35-foot utility drainage detention easement along the back of the property. **K. Wolf** there is also a house right behind this lot so pushing it back will push it right up to that house. **M. Hopkins** is this a home owner's association covenant restriction or part of the PUD. **K. Stone** this is with the PUD. If it was simply with the covenants it would not come before this commission. The Village does not enforce private covenants. The Village does enforce the setbacks and the separation requirements that are part of the PUD. **M. Werden** is this the only property that has requested a variation like this in this subdivision? **K. Stone** yes, it is. **G. Koziol** what would be the distance from the wall of the proposed garage to the property line and the house next door? **D. Kamperschroer** the distance is 17-1/3 feet from the garage to the lot line and 27-1/3 feet to the neighboring home. **M. Hopkins** if you had know about this requirement you could have had your architect design a narrower home. **K. Wolf** yes, possibly or push the house back further, but we are worried about water. **M. Hopkins** are the neighbors for or against this? **K. Wolf** we personally spoke with the neighbors on the left side. **K. Stone** the residents that I spoke with at the counter were not directly abutting the site. They just said they lived in the neighborhood. **K. Wolf** I do wonder if some of the neighbors do not want a house built there because of the construction noise and it is not really about the square footage between the houses. **J. Miaso** the builder built that house as close to the lot line as possible to keep the neighboring lot vacant. **C. Deveaux** does the PUD require 30 feet between houses? **K. Stone** yes, the Planned Unit Development changed the setbacks. Instead of both lots requiring a minimum of 15 feet, one lot could have a minimum of 7-1/2 feet provided there was still 30 feet between structures. **K. Wolf** since the house to the left of our lot is at 7-1/2 feet we are now expected to make up for that. **D. Kamperschroer** the



Village of Bartlett  
Planning and Zoning Commission  
July 7, 2022

---

house on left, 1273 Keim Trail is about 8-1/2 feet from the lot line and the house on the right, 1281 Keim Trail is 7-1/2 feet from the lot line. **K. Stone** both of the neighboring properties met the 7-1/2-foot requirement. **J. Miaso** that lot was purchased by the original owner to stay vacant and that is why the house next to that lot is 7-1/2 feet from the lot line. **G. Koziol** if the garage is built, from the garage wall to the house wall to the left when facing the front is 27.35 feet, which is the 2-1/2-foot difference. There is still a reasonable amount of space there. **B. Bucaro** the other side would be 24.8 feet, which is about 5-1/4 feet. Being the last house obviously the two houses on each side were built with the minimum required distances.

**M. Werden** opened the public hearing portion of the meeting.

**Jay Monaghan, 1266 Keim Trail** asked, what is being requested? Does the petitioner want to build a house that is bigger than the other houses and is it going to be closer than the other houses? Is that the issue? **M. Werden** they said they want to build it similar to the other house, which would be about 3,000 square feet. **J. Monaghan** what are they requesting that they are closer to the houses next to them? **M. Werden** they have to have 7-1/2 feet to the lot line and 30-feet between the building, but because the other houses were there first there is no room to have 30-feet between the two buildings with this proposal. **J. Monaghan** I do not think it makes sense to allow someone to build a home that is going to be too close to the homes next to it. That would lower the value. I do not understand what the issue is. **D. Kamperschroer** it would be about 25 feet on one side and about 27 feet on the other side. **J. Miaso** the house at 1275 Keim Trail was built 7-1/2 feet from the property line and you have to have 30-feet between the buildings and petitioner is asking to have 27-feet and 24-feet of separation. **J. Monaghan** it would be almost 30 feet. I do not understand what the issue is. **M. Hopkins** the issue is, instead of the required 30 feet, the petitioner is requesting a distance of about 25 feet on one side and 27 on the other side. **Rosaura Realengeno, 1273 Keim Trail** our concern is noise from the construction and having privacy when that is happening. It would help if it was 30 feet. We do not mind a little bit less, but if those requirements are there why are they planning this if they know it does not meet the requirements? **M. Hopkins** the petitioners are stating that it was a surprise to them after they bought the property and it is a unique situation. **M. Werden** the people on either side of the empty lot did not allow 15 feet on their side presuming that they would have 15 feet. They took advantage of having an empty lot there and so now being the last lot, the petitioner is trying to build a house that would fit in with the neighborhood. **K. Wolf** when we were designing the house, we designed it to have the garage on the left side of the house so that we were not looking into the neighbor's family room for their privacy and for our privacy. **G. Koziol** the houses on each side of this lot took full advantage when building. I think this is a reasonable request to want to fit this home here because it is not the petitioner's fault that the space has already been used up by the existing homes. **B. Bucaro** I think this is a unique situation that the new owner is having to deal with. Based on the findings of fact, this is a small variance request to be able to utilize the lot to build a house of similar design and size to the other houses in the neighborhood. I do not have a problem with that. **M. Werden** I agree. I think the neighbors on each side took advantage of having that empty lot there. We should give some type of relief for a house to be built there.



Village of Bartlett  
Planning and Zoning Commission  
July 7, 2022

---

**G. Koziol** made a motion to pass along **a positive recommendation** to the Village Board to approve case **(#22-10) 1277 Keim Trail Variations to reduce the required 30-foot building separation** subject to the findings of fact outlined in the staff report.

**Motioned by: G. Koziol**

**Seconded by: J. Miaso**

**M. Werden** closed the public hearing portion of the meeting.

**Roll Call**

**Ayes: B. Bucaro, C. Deveaux, M. Hopkins, J. Kapadoukakis, G. Koziol, J. Miaso, M. Werden**

**Nays: None**

**The motion carried.**



Village of Bartlett  
Planning and Zoning Commission  
July 7, 2022

---

**(#20-18) Dunkin Donuts (Schick)**  
**PUBLIC HEARING**

The following exhibits were presented:

**Exhibit A – Picture of Sign**

**Exhibit B – Mail Affidavit**

**Exhibit C – Notification of Publication**

The petitioner, **Eric Carlson**, ECA Architects & Planners, 24 N. Bennett St., Geneva came forward and was sworn in by the **Chairman, M. Werden**. **E. Carlson** stated. I am here representing the Dunkin Donuts franchisee. We are proposing a Dunkin Donuts with a drive-through on the northwest corner of Schick Road and Route 59. There is one lot there and we are dividing that lot. We are looking at lot 1 for the Dunkin Donuts. We are requesting four items. One is the preliminary plat of subdivision for the 2 lots that is currently one lot. The second request is for the site plan approval for the drive-through Dunkin Donuts, third is the special use permit for the drive-through as required in the B-3 PUD district, and fourth is the variation to allow parking in a corner side yard setback. The reason for the parking variation request is that there is a 25-foot right-of-way dedication along Route 59 that changes our original lot line. The ordinance is 50-feet and we are requesting 30-feet. **M. Werden** is that for a right turn lane or future widening of Route 59? **K. Stone** that would be for a future right turn lane. **E. Carlson** there is one access point that will be shared with lot 2 when it develops. You would come into our site with a one-way flow around the building. There would be a double drive-through for efficiency purposes. There are 16 parking spaces along Route 59. We are requesting a modification of the subdivision ordinance to eliminate parkway trees because there is a water main and utilities in the right-of-way and since we cannot put trees in the right-of-way, we are putting the trees on the adjacent property. The building is approximately 2,000 square feet with 12 indoor seats and an outdoor seating area for up to 24 seats. There will be landscaping along Schick Road and Route 59 in compliance with the ordinance. **M. Werden** will the traffic flow be one-way going north on the west frontage road along Route 59 and south on the east lot? **E. Carlson** yes, there will be a single access on the east side of the building. The building will comply with Dunkin Donuts prototypical look with cement board siding and white and pink accent panels with a small orange canopy consistent with newer Dunkin Donuts buildings. The owner is proposing a 24-hour facility although currently, due to labor shortages, when they first open it will be open at around 4 am until about 11 pm until staffing comes back. **M. Werden** is the only ingress/egress on Schick Road. **E. Carlson** that is correct. There is one access into the site. **C. Deveaux** when you come off of Route 59 and onto Schick Road, is there a plan to develop a turn lane on Schick Road? People come around that corner pretty quickly and it would make more sense to have a right turn lane. **K. Stone** there are not any plans to add a right turn lane. **M. Hopkins** are you aligning the curb cut with the 7-Eleven? **E. Carlson** yes, we are. **M. Hopkins** at the pinch point, are you confident that if the stacking backs up people will still have room to egress from the parking lot? **E. Carlson** yes, there would be enough room. **M. Hopkins** if you have a line of cars will there be room for people to pass the stacking of the cars? **E. Carlson** if there needs to be stacking it would be along the building. There would be enough room. **K. Stone** the drive aisle is 18 feet wide at that location.

**M. Werden** opened the public hearing portion of the meeting.



Village of Bartlett  
Planning and Zoning Commission  
July 7, 2022

---

**Jim Peplow, 1452 Quincy Bridge Court, President of the Brentwood Home Owner's Association** stated that this is a horrible intersection at Route 59 and Schick Road. There is constant traffic turning into the gas station, which has a turn lane there and there are always cars backed up there. I am concerned with the Dunkin Donuts being open 24 hours. I can guarantee you that the Home Owner's Association is not in favor of 24 hours. Other concerns are the garbage being located right next to the preschool, what will be done with lot 2, the flooding in our subdivision, what will this do to the water level in that area, and who will maintain the road. Right now, it is not maintained well. There are potholes. On the corner of Schick Road and Quincy Bridge Road there is a bus stop for the kids in the neighborhood. There is already traffic going to the car wash and the preschool, Culver's and Goodwill. That road is not big enough as it is. What about the lights? If there is a 24-hour store, the lights will be on all the time. The garbage pick-up is sometimes at 5 am and it is noisy. The main thing is, when there is a parking lot there and there is water, where is that water going to go? We are concerned about that.

**Sapna Patel, 1535 Southgate Road** stated, my children go to that preschool and I am concerned about traffic in the morning with the bus stop and the drop off to the preschool. My main concern is the children and the additional traffic in the morning.

**Reid Root, 1422 Quincy Bridge Court** it would help if we could get a stop sign at the corner of our condo complex on the corner of Quincy Bridge Court and Schick Road.

**Laura Baucom, 1456 Quincy Bridge Court** stated, I am mostly concerned about water discharge and what will be done with the other lot. Would there be a second access when there is a business on lot 2? Will the old trees stay or go?

**M. Werden** is there going to be underground storage?

**K. Stone** yes.

**Argelyn Bautista, 1441 Quincy Bridge Court** my concern is the safety of the children and the traffic.

**John Warner, 1417 Quincy Bridge Court** the entrance to the 7-Eleven frequently backs up. This area is dangerous because of the constant traffic. There is no room for any more traffic if there is no access from Route 59. Lot 2 is low lying and to raise the level to build on it will create a major problem for our neighborhood.

**G. Koziol** regarding the traffic flow, if you are going south on Route 59 and making a right turn to go west on Schick Road that is 1 lane and that 1 lane feeds the 7-Eleven and the proposed Dunkin Donuts. What will happen if traffic backs up on Schick Road between Route 59 and the 2 entrances? What kind of problem can this extend out to Route 59? Will this cause a queuing problem?

**K. Stone** when our traffic engineer looked at the traffic study she did not think that the Dunkin Donuts warranted any changes to what is existing, but stated that when lot 2 is developed, additional studying should be done on how the intersection is functioning.

**Eric Duquene, 1424 Quincy Bridge Court** when Culver's first went in I had asked about the traffic flow and we were told it was not going to be a problem, but it is a problem. There have been times where it takes me 15 minutes to get out of my subdivision to get to work because of the traffic. It is very dangerous for everybody in that area and I hope you look at that. I know the traffic study says there is no problem, but I cannot see how there is no problem with that traffic flow.

**B. Bucaro** is there any additional information from the traffic study? The study showed there is not a problem at Route 59 and Schick Road, but is there any other information in the study about traffic on Quincy Bridge Road and through the Culver's parking lot?

**K. Stone** Eric, is your traffic consultant here?

**E. Carlson** no, but primarily when Dunkin Donuts chooses a site, it is typically a commuter location and the busiest time is in the morning and after that it is pretty sparse. I think at this intersection it primarily will be south-bound traffic making that easy right turn. As far as exiting onto Route 59 the traffic study did not show any issues.

**Sandra Farrell, 1282 Eagle Court** I think you are going to attract a lot of high school kids and I am concerned about the safety with the blind spot on Quincy Bridge Court.

**J. Kapadoukakis** could the petitioner address the water flow as far as the concerns that these residents have?

**E. Carlson** on the southwest



Village of Bartlett  
Planning and Zoning Commission  
July 7, 2022

---

corner of the site there is a floodplain area. That is not part of our site, but as one of the requirements in a new development with today's standards, you cannot have any runoff onto adjacent properties and any runoff has to be captured and released into a detention area that is specified and sized appropriately for these lots. That is why we will have the underground detention. As far as the trees, I cannot tell you specifically what is staying, but any trees we take out will be replaced. We do have a nice line of trees on the west property line as well as the south end of our site. For the trash dumpster, those will be enclosed and will not be visible. We will comply with the pick-up times for trash in line with the other businesses and the ordinance. **M. Hopkins** does the Village have any issues with the petitioner's traffic study? **K. Stone** they concurred with the study, but felt additional studies would be needed when lot 2 is developed. **M. Hopkins** is the result of the traffic study that the Dunkin Donuts would provide no substantial change to the current condition and would not have a significant impact on the existing pattern, good or bad and that our Village Engineer is going to ensure that this site performs better in its developed form than it is current form with regard to storm water discharge? **K. Stone** correct. The purpose of the traffic impact study is to look at the impact from this development and effects that this development will have on the existing traffic patterns. The Village is aware that at some point there may be a need for a left turn lane on Quincy Bridge Road and 2 of the developments north of Chesterbrook Academy did pay a portion towards these future turn lane improvements. The Village would have to have a traffic study completed of the entire area as suggested in 2005.

**M. Hopkins** made a motion to pass along **a positive recommendation** to the Village Board to approve case **(#20-18) Dunkin Donuts (Schick) Preliminary/Final Subdivision** subject to the conditions and findings of fact outlined in the staff report.

**M. Werden** closed the public hearing portion of the meeting.

**Motioned by: M. Hopkins**  
**Seconded by: B. Bucaro**

**Roll Call**

**Ayes: B. Bucaro, M. Hopkins, J. Kapadoukakis, G. Koziol, J. Miaso, M. Werden**  
**Nays: C. Deveaux**

**The motion carried.**

**M. Hopkins** made a motion to pass along **a positive recommendation** to the Village Board to approve case **(#20-18) Dunkin Donuts (Schick) Site Plan** subject to the conditions and findings of fact outlined in the staff report.

**Motioned by: M. Hopkins**  
**Seconded by: J. Miaso**



Village of Bartlett  
Planning and Zoning Commission  
July 7, 2022

---

**Roll Call**

**Ayes:** B. Bucaro, M. Hopkins, J. Kapadoukakis, G. Koziol, J. Miaso, M. Werden

**Nays:** C. Deveaux,

**The motion carried.**

**M. Hopkins** made a motion to pass along **a positive recommendation** to the Village Board to approve case **(#20-18) Dunkin Donuts (Schick) Special Use** subject to the conditions and findings of fact outlined in the staff report.

**Motioned by:** M. Hopkins

**Seconded by:** J. Miaso

**Roll Call**

**Ayes:** B. Bucaro, M. Hopkins, J. Kapadoukakis, G. Koziol, J. Miaso, M. Werden

**Nays:** C. Deveaux,

**The motion carried.**

**M. Hopkins** made a motion to pass along **a positive recommendation** to the Village Board to approve case **(#20-18) Dunkin Donuts (Schick) Variation** subject to the conditions and findings of fact outlined in the staff report.

**Motioned by:** M. Hopkins

**Seconded by:** B. Bucaro

**Roll Call**

**Ayes:** B. Bucaro, M. Hopkins, J. Kapadoukakis, G. Koziol, J. Miaso, M. Werden

**Nays:** C. Deveaux,

**The motion carried.**





Village of Bartlett  
Planning and Zoning Commission  
July 7, 2022

---

**(#22-03) Cannabis in Commercial Districts  
PUBLIC HEARING**

**The following exhibits were presented:  
Exhibit A – Notification of Publication**

**K. Stone** before you is a Text Amendment addressing adult use and medical cannabis dispensing centers and possibly allowing them in commercial districts. Currently, we only allow one in the Blue Heron Business Park and one in the Brewster Creek Business Park. The Village received a concept plan for an adult use dispensary in Town Center. The petitioner withdrew their application immediately before it was to be discussed at the Village Board meeting. The Village Board directed staff to draft the text amendment to remove the distance requirements that were previously in our definition. Our definition originally followed the State's definition and the State removed the distance requirement. We want our definitions to match the State's definitions. The amendments before you are to remove the limit of one adult dispensing center in Blue Heron Business Park and one in Brewster Creek Business Park. We are also adding medical dispensing centers to the list of prohibited uses in the B-1 Village Center District. That would make adult use cannabis and medical cannabis centers Special Uses in B-2, B-3, and B-4 Zoning Districts. We are proposing to allow adult use and medical cannabis dispensing centers in the B-2, B-3 and B-4 commercial districts provided they are not located in the downtown overlay. The Village Board is concerned about allowing this downtown and wanted to have a discussion about it. **B. Bucaro** what are the Board's concerns specifically? **M. Hopkins** could you please clarify what you are asking the Planning & Zoning Commission to do? **K. Stone** we are asking if you are okay with the Text Amendments as proposed. **M. Hopkins** the Village Board is setting these policies and we are simply reviewing the text to see if that works within the constraints of how the zoning codes operates. **K. Stone** yes and they would also appreciate your input on if you agree. You are a recommending body and the Board would like your recommendations. **M. Werden** I think we want to follow what the State is doing. **K. Stone** yes, for the definitions. Villages that are home rule have the authority to limit where these can be located with the zoning. **M. Hopkins** what would the separation limits be for residential, a daycare or a school be? **K. Stone** there would be no limit. It would match the State's requirements. **M. Werden** would it be allowed at Stearns Road and Route 59? **K. Stone** yes. **J. Kapadoukakis** it would be allowed anywhere we have commercial except for downtown. **K. Stone** correct, because that is in the downtown overlay district. **B. Bucaro** my question is, why eliminate the downtown area? Is it because of a concern about traffic? There is not a lot of traffic in downtown Bartlett and traffic in downtown would be a good thing. I do not feel strongly either way that the overlay district remains or is taken out, but if it is about traffic, I do not see that as a big issue. I do not know if other towns have had issues or problems that we could learn from. Certainly, loosening the restrictions that were put in previously is good. I am fine with removing any distance requirements and I am fine with opening it up to commercial districts. I do question whether we are being shortsighted by not allowing it in the downtown overlay district. **J. Miaso** was the concern that the residents downtown did not want this? **K. Stone** I do not know if it is the residents who do not want it. There may have been concerns with the one proposal that we had with residents directly above the location, but the Village Board did not specifically state what their concerns were, just that they had concerns with dispensaries being downtown. **M. Hopkins** technically, in terms of parking, a commercial establishment and uses, that is fine, but this is a political decision. We are appointed officials and a recommending



Village of Bartlett  
Planning and Zoning Commission  
July 7, 2022

---

body. I do not think it our responsibility to set policy. I do not see any technical issues with what is proposed, but I hesitate to go any further than that. Would each case be reviewed on its own especially for impact on neighboring uses? **K. Stone** yes, you are not changing the special use requirements for dispensaries. It was very detailed and goes into the impacts that it would have. **M. Hopkins** we would need purview to go into saying no to a special use because of impact on adjacent uses. **K. Stone** a typical special use has 3 findings of fact. There is a litany of findings of fact for this. **J. Kapadoukakis** if we look at this as a special use we can set those guidelines, like if it is close to a school. **K. Stone** you look at the impacts of that use in that location. You are looking at each one on a case by case basis. Someone could not just move into a location and open up. They would have to go before this Commission and the Village Board, and would have to meet the criteria. It is very regulated. That is why it is a special use and not a permitted use. **G. Koziol** I think that State laws should be followed. I am not in favor of imposing distances. I think that creates more problems in the future. I have a slight concern about the overlay district. Downtown Bartlett really does not have traffic and we have an abundance of parking now. Maybe it could work. If it has to be approved on a case by case basis for special use, I am okay with it. We should not restrict it from the downtown overlay. It might be a good thing. **B. Bucaro** again, from a traffic and parking standpoint, that is not a problem. **C. Deveaux** you are right, there is open parking. Do we send this as it is or add that the downtown overlay be removed? **K. Stone** if you prefer, we can add a summary of what this discussion was and include the discussion in the executive summary. You can make recommendations about what is presented and include the discussion points as well. You can say that you recommend the text amendment and include the items that need additional discussion. **B. Bucaro** I would suggest that we look at other towns to get an idea of any problems they have had. We do not have that experience because we do not have any establishments. **G. Koziol** I do not recall hearing anything. It is almost like it does not exist. I do not think there have been any real problems. We are going to force out a business just because of something we are not sure of that might not even ever happen and say no just because. I am not in favor of that. **K. Stone** there is the option that if you leave it as is and someone wants to locate within the downtown overlay, they could petition for a text amendment as part of their petition. We have had circumstances where there is a use that is not allowed in the current zoning ordinance and so it is addressed in conjunction with their application. **B. Bucaro** I do not know if I like that. We are making them jump through hoops. **K. Stone** it would all be done at the same time. It would be a public hearing for a text amendment to allow a special use and a request for a special use permit. We did the same thing with True North for the truck stop at W. Bartlett Road and Route 25. Per the current Zoning Ordinance, the applicant for Town Center could not go into Town Center at all. It is prohibited. We asked the applicant to apply as a concept because we did not know how receptive the Village Board would be to that proposal. The Board never got to give their input to that proposal because the applicant withdrew, but it did start the discussion about allowing dispensaries within the commercial districts. That is what brought this on. Had that applicant gone forward and the Village Board reviewed that, it is possible that they would have come forward with the text amendment and the special use request. We are trying to be preemptive before we get another application. **J. Miaso** is everything done on a case by case basis? **K. Stone** yes, because it is a special use. **J. Miaso** the trustees want our input. These stores have very tight security. I have been to the dispensary in Oak Park and that is in the middle of their downtown. There were no problems whatsoever. **C. Deveaux** staff has recommended that the Planning & Zoning Commission review this text amendment and make their recommendations. **K. Stone** correct. You can approve, modify or deny the text amendments. I



Village of Bartlett  
Planning and Zoning Commission  
July 7, 2022

---

can word my executive summary to say that the Commission had a discussion about allowing it in the downtown overlay district and decided to recommend approval as written. **B. Bucaro** if a case comes to the Commission for a specific text amendment, we will have to look at it on a case by case basis. **J. Miaso** we need the traffic. It is not a problem. **M. Werden** I still have reservations if it is close to a school. **M. Hopkins** I think we need to protect the adjacent uses. **K. Stone** you can say that you want to keep the distance requirements as part of your recommendation. You can say that you think that is important and you want to keep that portion in the ordinance as it stands now. One of the conditions in the findings of fact is that "the proposed facility will not negatively impact existing or future uses located within the vicinity of the subject property." If you do not want to remove the distance requirement or you want to reduce it to 200 feet or 500 feet that is a recommendation that you can make. **B. Bucaro** I do not think 1000 feet would work because that would eliminate many of the potential commercial locations. **K. Stone** it is worded now as excluding residential purposes, daycares, schools and preschools. If you want to eliminate the residential uses and leave in the schools and daycares, you could do that. **G. Koziol** I think keeping the distance requirements would cause additional problems. For example; Streets of Bartlett, Lake Street and Oak Avenue, Stearns Road and Route 59 near the Walgreen's. I am not in-favor of keeping distances at all. **J. Kapadoukakis** I am concerned that this would affect property values. **J. Miaso** you are looking at a noise factor and a traffic factor, that is all. **M. Hopkins** we are not equipped because we do not know the ramifications or how these operate, or what other municipalities are doing. **K. Stone** most towns are allowing them in their commercial districts. Hanover Park does not, Streamwood, Schaumburg does as a special use, St. Charles, Villa Park, Westmont, and Wheeling all allow dispensaries as a special use. Many municipalities do not allow them in their downtown or town centers. Lombard and Wheeling are two that allow it in their downtown as a special use, but most of the others that we surveyed do not. **G. Koziol** I am hearing a lot of discussion about what we like and we do not like. What are we recommending to the Village Board? **K. Stone** I can summarize the discussion. There needs to be a motion. The motion can fail or the motion can pass.

**M. Werden** opened the public hearing portion of the meeting. No one from the public came forward.

**B. Bucaro** made a motion to pass along **a positive recommendation** to the Village Board to approve case **(#22-03) Cannabis in Commercial Districts Text Amendment** as written with an executive summary to include the Commission's discussion regarding the downtown overlay.

**M. Werden** closed the public hearing portion of the meeting.

**Motioned by: B. Bucaro**

**Seconded by: J. Miaso**

**Roll Call**

**Ayes: B. Bucaro, C. Deveaux, J. Kapadoukakis, G. Koziol, J. Miaso,**

**Nays: M. Werden, M. Hopkins**

**The motion carried.**



**Village of Bartlett  
Planning and Zoning Commission  
July 7, 2022**

---

**Old Business/ New Business**

**K. Stone** there are still some minor changes to be made to the Rules of Procedure. We will make those changes and review the Rules of Procedure again next month. We will have Bannerman's on the agenda next month. They are looking at moving into Brewster Creek Business Park.

**M. Werden** asked if there was a motion to adjourn.

**Motioned by: C. Deveaux**

**Seconded by: M. Hopkins**

**Motion passed by unanimous voice vote.**

**The meeting was adjourned at 10:00 pm.**