

**DOWNERS GROVE LIQUOR COMMISSION
VILLAGE HALL COUNCIL CHAMBERS
801 BURLINGTON AVENUE
Thursday, August 5, 2021**

I. CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Strelau called the August 5, 2021 Liquor Commission meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

II. ROLL CALL

PRESENT: Mr. Jacobson, Mr. Johnson, Mr. Meta, Mr. Rausch, Mr. Shah, Chairman Strelau

ABSENT: Mr. Krusenoski

STAFF: Carol Kuchynka, Liaison to the Liquor Commission, Assistant Village Attorney Dawn Didier

OTHERS: Ryan Jansky, Mandeep Kaur, Mantaj Singh, Beth Renchin, Tim Carroll, Esq., Court Reporter (late)

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Chairman Strelau asked for approval of the minutes for the May 6, 2021 Liquor Commission meeting and asked members if there were any corrections, changes or additions.

Hearing no changes, corrections or additions, the May 6, 2021 minutes of the Liquor Commission meeting were approved as written.

Chairman Strelau reminded those present that this evening's meeting was being recorded on Village-owned equipment. Staff was present to keep minutes for the record.

IV. APPLICATION FOR LIQUOR LICENSE

Chairman Strelau made the following statements:

"The next order of business is to conduct a public hearing for liquor license applications. For the benefit of all present, I would like to state that this Commission does not determine the granting or denial of the issuance of any license. We may, at the end of each hearing, make a finding or recommendation with respect to the application. If necessary, the Commission may adjourn a hearing to a later date in order to have benefit of further information."

"At the conclusion of the hearing, the Commission will summarize its findings and determine any recommendations it wishes to make to the Liquor Commissioner."

"The Liquor Commissioner, who is the Mayor of Downers Grove, will, pursuant to Section 3-12 of the Ordinance, render decisions regarding issuance of available liquor licenses within 60 days."

"Hearings by this Commission are held according to the following format: 1) reading of information pertinent to the application, 2) comments from the applicant, 3) discussion by the Commission, 4) comments from staff, 5) comments from the public, and 6) motion and finding by the Commission."

Cellar Door – 5150 A Main Street

Chairman Strelau stated that the first order of business was an application hearing for RJRJ, LLC d/b/a Cellar Door located at 5150 A Main Street. She stated that the applicant was seeking a Class "WB", beer and wine, on- and off-premise consumption liquor license and a Class "O" outdoor liquor license.

Chairman Strelau asked that any individual(s) representing the applicant step forward and be seated. She asked that any individual(s) giving testimony, state and spell their name for the record, indicate their affiliation with the establishment and be sworn in by staff.

Mr. Ryan Jansky was sworn in by Notary, Dawn Didier.

Chairman Strelau asked the applicant to present its case.

Mr. Jansky introduced himself as the general manager who has been employed at the Cellar Door for the past 7 1/2 years. He stated that current owner Sean Chaudry is looking to step back from his obligations and that he was looking to buy the business from him.

Mr. Jansky stated that it is a well-established business that has been in operation since 2005. He stated that they are a good wine/beer bar with a kitchen, nice patio and a retail sales component. He stated that he would like to continue in Downers Grove.

Mr. Jacobson stated that he reviewed the application materials and noted Mr. Jansky's experience working at Cellar Door. Mr. Jacobson stated it was a viable business and had no questions.

Mr. Rausch stated he reviewed the materials and was pleased that it will remain business as usual and had no questions.

Mr. Shah had no questions.

Mr. Johnson noted Mr. Jansky's years of experience. He stated the packet was extensive and thorough. He noted that his along with BASSET certifications from several employees were included. Mr. Johnson asked Mr. Jansky how often he meets with staff to go over alcohol service policies. Mr. Jansky replied that they have a small staff. He stated that the management team meets one a month and they hold quarterly all staff meetings where carding and liquor license rules are reviewed.

Mr. Johnson asked Mr. Jansky how often the patio is fully occupied. Mr. Jansky replied in good weather they are filled every night and is half full during lunch. Mr. Johnson asked how the outdoor dining area is monitored. Mr. Jansky replied that there are floor to ceiling windows in the front of the shop which he can see the entirety of from the register area. He stated that staff is coming in and out constantly.

Mr. Johnson asked if there is a dedicated server outdoors. Mr. Jansky replied yes. He stated that they have both a dedicated indoor and outdoor server.

Mr. Meta asked for clarification if there was a change being requested to the type of license. Mr. Johnson replied that it was only a request for a change in the legal entity.

Chairman Strelau was pleased that he is willing to continue on with the business.

Chairman Strelau asked Mr. Jansky what principal change he would need to make to improve upon the business. Mr. Jansky replied not a lot. He stated that even through 2020 when they could not have dine in, the retail component grew exponentially and continues to be strong. He stated that the kitchen

continues to put out good food and the establishment has a fun and casual atmosphere which he would like to continue.

Chairman Strelau asked how often Sean has meetings with servers. Mr. Jansky replied that Sean was present at all of the management team meetings and quarterly staff meetings.

Chairman Strelau stated that it matters what the management staff thinks and does and that employees take their key how to behave and run the shop properly. She stated that she may talk to them more than once a month. Mr. Jansky also noted that he has a daily reminder check list. He stated that he will speak with employees on a more regular basis.

Chairman Strelau asked staff for recommendations or comments pertinent to this application. Ms. Kuchynka replied that issuance of the license is contingent upon receipt of the updated Certificate of Occupancy, dram shop insurance, pro-rated annual fee and satisfactory background checks.

Chairman Strelau asked for comments from the public. There were none.

Hearing the testimony given in this case, Chairman Strelau asked for a recommendation from the Commission concerning its finding of "qualified" or "not qualified" with respect to the applicant with regard to their Class "WB" liquor license application.

MR. JACOBSON MOVED TO FIND RJRJ, LLC D/B/A CELLAR DOOR LOCATED AT 5150 A MAIN STREET QUALIFIED FOR A CLASS "WB", BEER AND WINE, ON AND OFF-PREMISE CONSUMPTION LIQUOR LICENSE. MR. RAUSCH SECONDED.

VOTE:

Aye: Mr. Jacobson, Mr. Rausch, Mr. Johnson, Mr. Meta, Mr. Shah, Chairman Strelau

Nay: None

Abstain: None

MOTION CARRIED: 6:0:0

Hearing the testimony given in this case, Chairman Strelau asked for a recommendation from the Commission concerning its finding of "qualified" or "not qualified" with respect to the applicant with regard to their Class "O" liquor license application.

MR. JACOBSON MOVED TO FIND RJRJ, LLC D/B/A CELLAR DOOR LOCATED AT 5150 A MAIN STREET QUALIFIED FOR A CLASS "O", OUTDOOR LIQUOR LICENSE. MR. JOHNSON SECONDED.

VOTE:

Aye: Mr. Jacobson, Mr. Johnson, Mr. Meta, Mr. Rausch, Mr. Shah, Chairman Strelau

Nay: None

Abstain: None

MOTION CARRIED: 6:0:0

Cheap Cheap Liquor – 2263 Maple Avenue

Chairman Strelau stated that the next order of business was an application hearing for Cheap Cheap Liquor, Inc. d/b/a Cheap Cheap Liquor located at 2263 Maple Avenue. She stated that the applicant was seeking a Class "P-1", full alcohol, off-premise consumption liquor license.

Chairman Strelau asked that any individual(s) representing the applicant step forward and be seated. She asked that any individual(s) giving testimony, state and spell their name for the record, indicate their affiliation with the establishment and be sworn in by the court reporter.

Mr. Mantaj Singh and Ms. Mandeep Kaur were sworn in by the court reporter.

Chairman Strelau asked the applicant to present its case.

Mr. Singh stated that they are seeking to obtain a liquor license for their second location. He stated that have held a liquor license in Plainfield for the past 13 years.

Mr. Singh stated that they treat their customers well and buy in bulk to keep their margins low and sell liquor as cheap as possible to their customers.

Chairman Strelau asked for questions from the Commission.

Mr. Meta asked Mr. Singh to elaborate on their current location. Mr. Singh stated that they have been in operation for 13 years. He stated it is a retail building and they have expanded it as they originally had a space problem because they buy in bulk. He stated that they were seeking a second location to expand.

Mr. Meta asked Mr. Singh with the expansion how he plans on staffing the new location. Mr. Singh replied that his mother will be at the Downers Grove location and his dad and two other employees at the Plainfield location. He stated that they intend to hire two more employees here.

Mr. Meta asked about the Joliet location. Mr. Singh stated that the license is issued by Joliet, but their corporation is out of Plainfield.

Mr. Meta asked if they had any underage sales. Mr. Singh replied that an employee was terminated for selling tobacco to a minor twice.

Mr. Johnson had no questions.

Mr. Jacobson asked when an employee sells to an underage customer, what is their policy on reprimanding. Mr. Singh replied that they are required to go to court. He stated that they will continue to supervise them. He stated that they have daily reminders about checking identification.

Mr. Jacobson asked what happens if a second violation occurs. Mr. Singh replied termination would result after a second violation.

Mr. Rausch had no questions.

Mr. Shah had no questions.

Chairman Strelau thanked them for choosing Downers Grove for their second location.

Chairman Strelau asked Mr. Singh if staff explained the liquor control buy program where underage agents attempt to purchase liquor. Mr. Singh replied yes. She asked if Plainfield conducts tests as well. Mr. Singh replied yes. Chairman Strelau asked how they did on the test. Mr. Singh replied they passed all but the two incidents.

Chairman Strelau stated that they have held a license for 13 years and their job is to sell liquor to only people over the age of 21. She stated that she has concern when an employee fails a liquor test and often wonders if it was just the one night when the special agent came in that they sold to a minor. She stated that they should speak to employees more frequently that they have one job to do and sell to those only over 21.

Chairman Strelau asked staff for recommendations or comments pertinent to this application. Ms. Kuchynka replied that issuance of the license is contingent upon receipt of the Certificate of Occupancy, dram shop insurance, pro-rated annual fee, satisfactory background checks and employee certifications.

Hearing the testimony given in this case, Chairman Strelau asked for a recommendation from the Commission concerning its finding of "qualified" or "not qualified" with respect to the applicant with regard to their Class "P-1" liquor license application.

MR. JACOBSON MOVED TO FIND CHEAP CHEAP LIQUOR, INC. D/B/A CHEAP CHEAP LIQUOR LOCATED AT 2263 MAPLE AVENUE QUALIFIED FOR A CLASS "P-1", FULL ALCOHOL, OFF-PREMISE CONSUMPTION LIQUOR LICENSE. MR. JOHNSON SECONDED.

VOTE:

Aye: Mr. Jacobson, Mr. Johnson, Mr. Meta, Mr. Rausch, Mr. Shah, Chairman Strelau

Nay: None

Abstain: None

MOTION CARRIED: 6:0:0

V. NEW BUSINESS

Chairman Strelau asked if there was any discussion, update from staff or comments from the Commission regarding any new business.

Ms. Kuchynka stated that a draft ordinance for the creation of a salon liquor license classification was prepared based upon a request from a new local business. She stated that Beth Renchin and Tim Carroll, Esq. were present to discuss their request.

Ms. Kuchynka asked Ms. Renchin to introduce herself and elaborate on her request. Ms. Renchin replied that she recently opened Rybells Blow Dry Bar located at 5221 Main Street. She stated that they do not cut or color hair. She stated that they offer "blow out services" where customers get their hair washed and styled during a typical appointment in 45 minutes. She stated that she wanted to offer a complimentary glass of wine or champagne while customers receive their service.

Ms. Kuchynka stated that based upon this request, the Mayor asked staff to draft an ordinance creating a salon license class. She stated that she contacted surrounding communities, which information was

contained in the monthly packet. She added that each community was asked if they have a specific license, ounce limits, limited to beer/wine or full alcohol and any other specific limitations.

Ms. Kuchynka stated that staff tailored the ordinance to meet Downers Grove standards and to be consistent with existing codes while incorporating guidelines. She stated that the salon definition was crafted to match what is written in the Zoning Ordinance.

Ms. Kuchynka stated that the number of licenses available will need to be determined. She stated that only restaurant and hotel licenses are unlimited. She stated that normally when license classes are created, limits are put on them.

Ms. Kuchynka stated that staff is the first step of the license creation process. She explained to Ms. Renchin and her attorney that there is no guarantee on the adoption of this ordinance. She stated that a recommendation by the Commission to forward this to the Village Council for consideration would be required. She added that if it is adopted, there is also no guarantee that they would be found qualified for a license and noted that a separate application hearing would be required.

Ms. Kuchynka asked for the Commission's comments, concerns and remarks about the draft ordinance.

Mr. Johnson asked if there were any other license classifications that allow the complimentary service of alcohol. Ms. Kuchynka replied no. Ms. Didier noted that by law a licensee would be required to include liquor as part of a service. She stated that licensees cannot advertise alcohol "free" or "complimentary". Ms. Kuchynka noted that State law prohibits the giving away of alcoholic liquor but noted it may be allowed/advertised so long as it is worded properly and included in the cost of a service.

Ms. Kuchynka stated that the draft ordinance is worded so that a licensee would have the option to either choose to sell the drink or offer the drink as part of a service.

Mr. Jacobson asked if the sign making place had a license. Ms. Kuchynka replied yes, Board and Brush has a license.

Mr. Jacobson stated that there is a difference from selling liquor and making a profit and service being a part of a salon package deal.

Attorney Carroll stated that the offer would be one drink, per patron, per service.

Mr. Jacobson stated that he thought the survey was interesting with the different requirements.

Chairman Strelau asked of the communities on the list, did any of them have the blow out salon or a regular salon that does cut and color. Ms. Rybell stated that Temperance (Hinsdale) holds a license for a blow dry bar.

Mr. Jacobson noted that Elmhurst was the most costly of the licenses. Ms. Kuchynka stated that she has not completed a cost center analysis as of yet as she wanted to be sure this request would get forwarded to the Council for consideration before she spent staff time determining a license fee. She stated that license fees are set by Administrative Regulation approved by the Village Manager.

Chairman Strelau asked Ms. Renchin the size of her salon. Ms. Renchin replied that she has six stations.

Chairman Strelau asked if customers were in no longer than an hour. Ms. Renchin replied yes.

Chairman Strelau asked if the Commission was considering a license class for salons in general. Ms. Kuchynka replied yes. She stated that during the application hearing, the business model would be discussed by the applicant and they would testify about their day to day operation. Ms. Kuchynka stated that the ordinance was left general so that the business could decide whether to charge or include drinks as part of a package.

Ms. Didier stated that salons offering massages would not qualify. Ms. Kuchynka stated that massage establishments are prohibited from holding a liquor license in another chapter of the Municipal Code. She noted that any salon that would offer massages would be excluded from obtaining this license.

Chairman Strelau stated that a salon patron could have services that last 2-3 hours for a cut, perm, coloring process, blowout, etc. She stated while Rybell will not have customers in more than an hour, the Commission does have to consider that other salons may have customers who are in for an extended amount of time.

Chairman Strelau stated that Mr. Jacobson made a good point about charging for liquor and that it could change the dynamic as to whether liquor is for profit or a nice treat. She asked the Commission for their comments.

Mr. Meta commented that this could open the door for barbershops in town. Ms. Kuchynka stated that barbershops are included in the definition of salon.

Ms. Kuchynka noted that this ordinance was limited to beer and wine, no hard liquor or shots would be allowed.

Mr. Jacobson reviewed the alcohol by volume chart – men vs. women. He stated that if a woman under 120 pounds has two drinks in an hour they would be over the legal limit. He stated that one drink an hour for females would bring them below the DUI level. He felt that in lieu of allowing a certain number of drinks they might also want to limit the number of drinks offered per hour.

Ms. Kuchynka stated that Wheaton has the best example limiting the total drinks to three per customer, per day, but also limits drinks to one per hour. Chairman Strelau stated that they also stipulated the drink size. Ms. Kuchynka noted that the ounce limits of beer and wine differ. She stated the ordinance could read 1,12-ounce beer or 1, 6-ounce wine, per hour, no more than ____, should the Commission wish to recommend specifics.

Mr. Meta stated that he did not think that alcohol should be a profit center, but included in the cost of services. He stated that with the Elmhurst license, anyone can drink. Ms. Didier stated that the Downers Grove ordinance would require a service to be done in order to get a drink, so guests of customers who sit and wait cannot get a drink.

Chairman Strelau asked if controlled buys have been considered. Ms. Kuchynka replied yes. She stated that when she calculates the cost center analysis, the cost of the service would need to be incorporated into the license fee. She stated that licensees pay for their controlled buy. She noted that the Park District, for example, pays for two controlled buys, one at the club house and one on the greens.

Ms. Didier asked about the number of licenses. Mr. Meta stated that can be looked at, at any time. Ms. Kuchynka noted if we reach the limit of any classification and someone requests the number be increased, she has, in the past, requested that the Council amend the ordinance to amend the number of licenses.

Ms. Kuchynka stated that they typically limit the specialty license as shown in the draft ordinance. Chairman Strelau noted that some licenses are for very specific entities. Ms. Kuchynka stated that she

has had a number of requests for salon licenses over the years, however, nobody wanted to proceed with paying the one time license creation fee and having the license creation process started. Ms. Kuchynka stated that Ms. Renchin paid the license creation administrative fee which covers staff time, attorney review, presentation to the Council and public hearing costs.

Mr. Meta asked staff what demand may be for a salon license. Ms. Kuchynka replied it would depend on whether or not they have the option to charge and the costs of the license, she would guess five to ten. She noted that some may or may not qualify with the guidelines or care to meet limits set forth. She stated that Rocco & Rocco may not qualify as she thinks they offer massages. She stated that anyone offering massages will be eliminated.

Mr. Jacobson stated that holding a license is costly. Ms. Kuchynka replied yes. She stated that she included other community's fees in the survey. Mr. Jacobson noted the other costs involved such as dram shop insurance.

Ms. Kuchynka asked Ms. Renchin if all employees in the salon will be over 21. Ms. Renchin replied yes. Ms. Kuchynka noted that servers will need to be over 21.

Ms. Didier asked Ms. Renchin if she was open and how business was doing. Ms. Renchin replied that she opened two weeks ago. She stated the weekends have been busy, but slow during the week. She was hopeful that things will pick up in the next month. Chairman Strelau noted that there were a lot of opportunities such as homecoming, weddings, etc. that will be coming up.

Ms. Kuchynka asked Ms. Renchin to give the Commission a price point of her services. Ms. Renchin replied that their Signature Blow out is \$40, with a braid its \$48, an up do is \$65 and hair treatments are \$20.

Mr. Meta asked Ms. Renchin if she was a franchisee. Ms. Renchin replied no. Attorney Carroll stated that 10 Friends is a franchisee, Dry Bar is not. Ms. Kuchynka asked if either charges. Ms. Renchin replied Dry Bar charges each drink but was unsure about 10 Friends.

Chairman Strelau asked if the Commission should determine if an individual is charged at the end of a treatment differently for having three drinks than another patron who has a similar treatment that does not get charged. She stated that Rybells is different than a regular salon. She added that the haircut, dye job, etc. can all vary in price and would not know if someone was paying more or less for liquor. She wondered if checking that licensees were properly charging was enforceable.

Ms. Renchin stated that Level 1 Stylists cost less than Level 2 Stylists, and noted that they all have different prices, although each does the same service.

Mr. Meta stated that is why he would rather have the cost of the liquor included in a package deal and not charged separately in order to motivate a licensee to not give away more drinks. He stated that it would be a cost of doing business and can adjust prices accordingly.

Mr. Johnson stated that Ms. Renchin by doing so, is not charging by choice, and including them with a service.

Mr. Meta stated that he has been in barber shops where there has been a keg and guys just tap right into it. He stated that he would not want liquor to serve as a profit center or for people to just hang out and drink cheap beers and get a haircut.

Ms. Kuchynka stated that the salon class would be one of the very few licenses that allow beer and wine without food service. She stated that food service has been a component in licensing forever. Ms. Kuchynka stated that Glenview had a food service requirement. She noted that, in a hair cutting environment, may not be very appealing.

Mr. Johnson asked staff if they wanted direction on the potential number of licenses. Ms. Didier replied yes. Ms. Kuchynka replied it may be helpful but noted that determining a limit would be at the discretion of the Village Council.

Ms. Kuchynka asked the Commission if they would rather licensees have the option to charge or not as it seems to be a sticking point. Mr. Jacobson replied that there are pros and cons to each side. He added if they charged, people may be less likely to drink. She stated that the ordinance can be written that either or is fine, however, at application they would have to explain the business model and explain how they planned to offer the alcohol either included in the price of a service or a drink menu with pricing.

Ms. Didier stated that regardless of charging or not, limiting it to one an hour while getting a service, that in and of itself would limit.

Mr. Jacobson asked Ms. Renchin if one drink per hour would work for her business model. Ms. Renchin replied yes. She stated that ten of the minutes a customer's head is in a shampoo bowl and noted that one drink was what they were seeking. She stated that the salon is 900 square feet and others will not be hanging out there.

Ms. Kuchynka asked that although they are offering a drink and a customer is not a drinker, would they offer any other options a customer would have. Ms. Renchin replied that they currently offer water and coffee. Ms. Kuchynka wanted to be sure that people were not pressured into taking a drink if they did not want one.

Mr. Jacobson stated perhaps they can offer two packages, one that has a drink, the other not and change the price point. Ms. Renchin stated that was a thought as well by offering different packages.

Mr. Jacobson recommended that the Village limit the licenses to four. Ms. Kuchynka noted that depending on demand, the Village Council can amend the ordinance to increase the amount of licenses to accommodate those on a waiting list. Mr. Rauch recommended five. Chairman Strelau stated five.

Ms. Kuchynka noted that the license can be costly if establishments give away liquor. She stated that an applicant will need to pay an application fee, annual fee (TBD), dram shop insurance and a State license. She stated that it is not cheap to offer it but it may keep a lot of salons from obtaining a license. Ms. Kuchynka noted that Rybells may not get a lot of response for it as well and may see that the cost overruns the benefit.

Chairman Strelau asked whether it's complimentary or pay per drink. Ms. Kuchynka replied that the ordinance is written to allow either.

Ms. Kuchynka stated that licensees cannot offer or state "free" or "complimentary" in any advertisement pursuant to State law. She stated that it may be "included" with salon services.

Chairman Strelau felt that the Commission should pick one way or the other and not leave it either. Mr. Johnson asked Chairman Strelau for her reasoning. Chairman Strelau asked what would happen if a licensee came before the Commission and the drink was to be part of a package, and then decided to change their business model. She understood that licensees need to notify Carol and get permission for changes. Chairman Strelau noted that a licensee may decide that the package was not making the money

they hoped and start charging. She wondered how staff would notice this change. Ms. Didier stated that it did not matter, so long as they were charging.

Chairman Strelau stated that ordinances are normally written with a specific intent. Ms. Kuchynka stated that this would be the only license type that has the option to “include” liquor as part of a package rather than a by-the-drink cost.

Mr. Jacobson stated that they will always be charging somewhat but may lose money by including it in a package. He changed his opinion in that by charging and not charging, there are people that do not want a drink, nor pay for it.

Mr. Rausch stated that it’s a part of marketing and stated that if they have two packages they are pricing a drink into Package A and for those that do not want a drink if they choose Package B.

Chairman Strelau stated the Blow Dry Bar is a bit different from the rest of the salons where customers can go in for a cut, color and style. She wondered if packages for each one of those include a drink or not. She felt it may be simpler that a customer can have one drink an hour at 12 oz. beer, 4 oz. wine and the Commission should consider the wide realm of who is going to be using the license.

Mr. Rauch stated that there is no argument on the limitation of the quantity, but how do they want to go about pricing. He stated should it be included in a package or a-la-carte. He believes that there is some payment either way.

Ms. Didier understood Chairman Strelau’s concern of a licensee offering a packing and then deciding to charge. She wondered if the Village cares if they do or not.

Chairman Strelau asked staff what they need from the Commission. Ms. Didier asked if all were in favor of the concept in general. All replied yes.

Ms. Kuchynka noted that it now comes down to the semantics. Mr. Rausch stated that an applicant can pick either charging per drink or offer a package and leave it to their discretion.

Ms. Kuchynka stated that per the draft ordinance sale or service of liquor would be allowed. Mr. Jacobson noted that if a customer calls to book and does not mention a drink, does not mean they cannot order it later at the time of service and pay for it or pay for a different package that includes it. Ms. Didier also noted that the establishment would not ask at booking but only ask if they want to add or have a drink at the time of the service.

Mr. Jacobson stated that if licensees increase their liquor prices, they do not need to notify the Village.

Ms. Renchin noted that at the time of service, some that order a blow out might want to add a braid last minute and/or want a treatment. She stated that options can change the day of even though they can sign up for just the service on line.

Mr. Johnson stated that the Commission seems to be in agreement for creation of a salon license. He stated that they talked about numbers, limiting it to 4-5. The group concurred on five.

Mr. Johnson stated that the discussion may change Ms. Renchin’s business model, however, the Commission wanted to think it through. He stated that the fundamental steps have been made to move this forward. Ms. Kuchynka stated that the Council will have their input and vote on a draft. She stated that she can provide the Council with the draft allowing either complimentary or sale provisions,

give them the minutes and they can discuss additional provisions at the first reading. She stated that she would revise the ordinance to include limits. Mr. Meta noted to also add one drink per hour.

Ms. Kuchynka stated that 1, 12-oz. beer or 1, 6-oz. service of wine, per hour and limit the total amount to three drinks, per day, per person would be added to the draft. She asked if all were in agreement.

Chairman Strelau asked the Commission if they were in agreement to charge or no charge. Mr. Rauch stated that it should be left to the business owner. He felt that leaving it open they would have options. Mr. Jacobson stated that they should run the business as they want. Ms. Kuchynka stated that if the business model does change after they appear before the Commission, they can simply inform the Village of the change. Mr. Rauch stated that as the amount of drinks are limited, it is not going to become a profit center for the salons. He noted it may be a break even or a way to get someone in the door.

Chairman Strelau asked staff if they would need a motion. Ms. Kuchynka replied yes. Ms. Didier stated that a motion to recommend that the ordinance, as amended, be presented to the Village Council for consideration.

MR. RAUCH MOVED TO RECOMMENDED THAT THE VILLAGE COUNCIL MOVE FORWARD WITH THE CRAFTING OF A SALON LIQUOR LICENSE. MR. JACOBSON SECONDED.

VOTE:

Aye: Mr. Rausch, Mr. Jacobson, Mr. Johnson, Mr. Meta, Mr. Shah, Chairman Strelau

Nay: None

Abstain: None

MOTION CARRIED: 6:0:0

Ms. Renchin and Attorney Carroll thanked the Commission. Chairman Strelau wished them luck.

VI. OLD BUSINESS

Chairman Strelau asked if there was any discussion, update from staff or comments from the Commission regarding any old business.

Ms. Kuchynka referred to the month end reports of June and July. She stated that activities have picked up. She stated that she has had a few applications on file and planned on holding a September 2nd meeting.

Ms. Kuchynka stated that the Police Department reinstated controlled buys. She stated that all 32 tested passed.

Ms. Kuchynka stated that licensees have advised that business is increasing, however, many are facing difficulty finding staff.

Chairman Strelau noticed that the outdoor seating has been stretched out and seems to be popular. She asked if the Village will consider outdoor amendments in the future. Ms. Kuchynka replied that she believed so.

Ms. Kuchynka stated that while the cafés have expanded, she was unsure if continued operation in the street will be allowed. She stated that pedestrian and vehicular traffic safety are necessary. Ms. Kuchynka advised that the Village allowed the expansion due to the lack of available indoor dining due to Covid. She stated presumably, restaurants should be back to 100% capacity indoors when the pandemic subsides. Chairman Strelau noted that the downtown is now vibrant. She noted that Glen Ellyn downtown is very nice and they have closed Main Street.

Ms. Kuchynka stated that since Covid, Community Development issues permits for café's. She stated that under the liquor code, the area was to be enclosed. She stated that enclosure requirement has been eliminated since Covid. She stated that licensees have monitored their tables and the Village has not had issues, with the exception of minor encroachments. She stated that amendments to the Code might need to be discussed in the future.

Ms. Kuchynka advised that some licensees were required to enter into a license agreement, indemnify the Village and provide additional insurance to utilize any portion of a public right-of-way.

Mr. Meta asked if there were any discussions about gaming and if it would fall under the Commission's purview. Ms. Kuchynka stated that many licensees ask her regularly about it a lot most recently. She noted that recently the County revised their gaming regulations. She stated that the corner of Belmont & Maple (with the exception of the southwest corner) is unincorporated. She stated that the Amoco offers alcohol from their gas station and she heard that Angelo's offers gaming. She stated some licensees who questioned if gaming was allowed in Downers Grove did not realize that corner was unincorporated. Ms. Kuchynka referred to the zoning map on the wall and showed the Commission the pockets of unincorporated areas.

Mr. Rausch stated that there has been discussion by the Chamber as a lot of restaurants have inquired about it.

VII. COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC

There were none.

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

Concluding business for the evening, Chairman Strelau called for a motion to adjourn.

Mr. Jacobson moved to adjourn the August 5, 2021 meeting. The meeting was adjourned by acclamation at 7:50 p.m.