Plan Commission

Minutes of the Meeting on
May 7, 2020

Village of Homer Glen
14240 W 151st Street, Homer Glen, IL 60491
Community Room
1. Call to Order.

The meeting was called to order at 7:02 p.m. by Chairman Backal.

2. Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag.

3. Roll Call.

Members present (in the Board Room) at 7:02 p.m. were Chairman Backal, Member Kozor, Member Stanly, and Member McGary.

Members present via Zoom at 7:02 pm were Members Verdun, Hand and Foley.

Also present were Planning and Zoning Director Gadde, Senior Planner, Melissa King, Chief Building Official Joe Baber and Plan Commission Secretary, Gia Cassin. The minutes were recorded and transcribed by Gia Cassin.

4. Public Comment.

None

5. Minutes

March 19, 2020

Chairman Backal asked if there was a motion to approve the minutes as written. Member McGary made the motion, seconded by Member Stanly. All were in favor, zero (0) opposed, the motion carried.

April 2, 2020

Chairman Backal asked if there was a motion to approve the minutes as written. Member McGary made the motion, seconded by Member Stanly. All were in favor, zero (0) opposed, the motion carried.

6. New Business

a) HG – 2002-V, Bell Tower Plaza (Public Hearing): Consideration of a Variance to Section 75-56(D) of the Outdoor Lighting Regulations for the parking lot light improvements at 15750 S. Bell Road, Homer Glen, Illinois.

Director Gadde provided the background for this case. The lighting fixtures at Bell Tower Plaza have been replaced without securing an outdoor lighting permit. An outdoor lighting permit was submitted in late November 2019 and the photometric plan was sent to Farnsworth for review. Farnsworth has identified the following
outdoor lighting requirements to be met to satisfy the Village's outdoor lighting code requirements as it pertains to replacement of luminaires and supporting structures and the comments were forwarded to the applicant.

Section (75-59) (D) – FINAL PLAN SUBMISSION

- **12.09.19 FGI Comment:** Provide documentation/revisions for:
  - Site photometric calculation line at 36” above the property line and compliance with the light trespass requirements of 0.5 f/c.
  - Revised cut sheets to indicate 3000K CCT
  - Revised cut sheets for wall mounted fixture TYPES WPG and WPR to indicate a full cut-off type fixture.

A letter was received in March of 2020 addressing all of the above items except for meeting the following light source requirement. The Applicant stated that he was unaware of this requirement and the replacement cost would be approximately thirty thousand dollars ($30,000.00). The applicant further requested a variance to Section 75-56 (D) of the Outdoor Lighting Regulations for all the lighting fixture that have been installed.

Section (75-56) (D) – LIGHT SOURCE REQUIREMENTS

- **12/09/2019 FGI Comment:** Submitted cut sheets indicate that the wall mounted fixture Types WPG and WPR have a CCT of 5000K and the pole mounted fixture Types A, B, C and D have a CCT of 5000K. All lighting fixture types shall have a CCT of 3000K to comply with the Ordinance.

The plight of the applicant is due to the replacement of the light fixtures without securing an outdoor lighting permit. The replacements are projected to achieve an annual energy savings of $14,500 annually for the property owner. However, the variance between what was installed, which was the 5000K and what is permitted by code which is the 3000K is significant. While the Homer Glen Dark Sky ordinance is unique, the applicant should have checked with the Building Department prior to the installation rather than treat it as a maintenance project. Staff does not support this significant variance.

Chief Building Official Baber followed by providing a timeline of events. Mid-September of 2019, he was alerted to the lighting issue. Mr. Baber contacted the property owner to discuss the Village Code and the permit process and provided them with a lighting permit application. A permit was submitted in November 2019, and to date, the lighting permit has not been issued.

A motion was made to open the Public Hearing by Member Verdun, seconded by Member McGary. All in favor, the motion passed unanimously.

The applicant, Terry Smith who is an ESN Contractor for Bell Tower Plaza stepped up to present his position. Mr. Smith stated he was unaware of the color temperature in the Village of Homer Glen being 3000K. He stated his lack of awareness created an issue that would not be easy to remedy, and added that the hardship leading to this variance was the cost to correct this. His findings at the location were that the lighting system were antiquated, and
he replaced all of it. He explained there was a substantial ComEd incentive for this and they funded ninety (90) percent. Using the system put in place by Mr. Smith would save the property owner approximately fourteen-thousand five hundred dollars. ($14,500.00). He did try to adjust some of the tilts on the lights he installed to redirect the way the light would shine. Mr. Smith also explained that the lights currently installed are stock items, and the ones the Village will require him to replace with need to be ordered and take additional time.

Chairman Backal clarified this was viewed as a self-imposed hardship and what this contractor is really asking for is for forgiveness after the fact, since he didn't ask for permission in advance.

Contractor Smith stated that the work he had completed is considered maintenance in all other communities (except for Frankfort).

A total of forty-seven (47) Lumineers were replaced and twenty-five (25) foot poles were rewired. No poles were replaced.

Five (5) letters were sent to the Village for public comment rather than appear in person due to the current Covid19 crisis. Plan Commission Secretary read each one aloud. (letters attached at the end of these minutes)

A brief summary of the comments is described below:

Resident Cynthia Rataj presented a detailed opposition to the lighting citing the brightness.

Resident Margaret Sabo presented a detailed opposition to the lighting citing light pollution.

Resident Randy Juras presented a concise letter providing Dark Sky Association recommendations and that the current lighting is too bright.

Resident Joseph Turrise presented a concise letter reminding the Plan Commission that the ordinance required 3000K, requesting to have the current lights changed to meet the code.

Resident Andrew Panelli presented a letter stating as an HOA president of a nearby subdivision, he's been fielding many complaints on the lighting and is strongly in favor of the adhering to the current Village ordinances with no variance.

A motion was made to close the Public Hearing by member McGary, seconded by member Stanly. All in favor, zero (0) opposed, the motion carried.

The Plan Commission held a very brief discussion. Chairman Backal asked if there was a motion for this case.

Member Kozor made a motion to adopt staff's findings as the findings of the Plan Commission and to recommend denial of a Variance to Section 75-56 (D) of the Outdoor Lighting Regulations for the parking lot light improvements at 15750 S. Bell Road, Homer Glen, Illinois. [Bell Tower Plaza, Case No. HG-2002V]. The motion was seconded by Member McGary.
A Roll Call vote was taken, six (6) members voted in favor, one (1) opposed. The motion carried.

Chairman Backal moved to the next item on the agenda.

b. **HG-2003-S, Mugshots Bar and Grill:** Consideration of a Special Use for outdoor seating associated with a permitted restaurant with an exception to reduce the required unobstructed adjacent sidewalk from five (5) feet to zero (0) feet, as required in Section 220.835 of the Village of Homer Glen Zoning Ordinance, for Mugshots Bar & Grill located at 13031 W. 143rd Street, Homer Glen, Illinois in the C-1 Neighborhood Commercial Zoning District.

Senior Planner King presented the Background information on this case. Mugshots Bar & Grill is a permitted restaurant located in a west end unit tenant space in one of the primary buildings of the “Orland Oak” commercial shopping center. The restaurant is currently undergoing a commercial build-out and the tenant space does not currently have an outdoor seating area. The applicant is proposing an outdoor seating area directly outside of the tenant space and underneath an existing alcove. The proposed space will occupy a ten (10) by fifty (50) foot area. A proposed seating plan has been provided with approximately 9 tables and a minimum of a three (3) foot fence or wall will be included. A minimum of a five (5) foot walkway requirement is included in the proposal, and there is currently an existing ADA ramp just north of the proposed outdoor seating section. Senior Planner King concluded her presentation.

Steve Wood and John Smoger, owners of Mugshots Bar & Grill provided some additional information, including that this restaurant is a sports bar and they are currently considering including an outdoor television, with the controllers remaining inside the facility, and they may play music outside as well. They are considering limiting the hours for the outdoor seating section. They were planning to move forward, if approved, for June or July, all things considered.

Chairman Backal asked for a motion to open the Public Hearing. Member Foley made a motion to open the public hearing, seconded by Member Hand. All in favor, zero (0) opposed, the motion carried.

One (1) letter was received by a resident for public comment. Senior Planner King read the letter aloud, written by Cynthia Saenger, who lives directly behind this end of the Orland Oak mall. Ms. Saenger provided a detailed letter explaining personal family situations and health issues she is concerned about that could be impacted by the outdoor seating, including smoke and loud crowds. This resident did provide a solution to the smoking issue and suggested it be placed at the front of the store, making it further from her property. (see attached letter).

The public hearing concluded and Member Foley made a motion to close the Public Hearing, seconded by Member Stanly. All in favor, zero (0) opposed, the motion carried.

The Plan Commission discussed this case and some possible scenarios to provide some form of barrier between the restaurant and the property owner behind. The restaurant is approximately seventy-five (75) feet off of the rear property line of resident Saenger.
Suggestions included construction of some type of wall at the back end of this outdoor seating area, that included some form of entry/exit. Discussion about finding a way to minimize the visibility and buffer the noise were discussed. The owners of the restaurant were open to ideas and willing to consider anything.

Chairman Backal asked for a motion. Member Verdun made a motion to adopt staff’s findings as the findings of the Plan Commission and to recommend for approval of a Special Use Permit for outdoor seating associated with a permitted restaurant with an exception to reduce the required unobstructed adjacent sidewalk from five (5) feet to zero (0) feet, as required in Section 220.835 of the Village of Homer Glen Zoning Ordinance, for Mugshots Bar & Grill located at 13031 W. 143rd Street, Homer Glen, Illinois in the C-1 neighborhood Commercial Zoning District [Mugshots Outdoor Seating, Case No. HG-2003-S]. The motion was seconded by Member McGary.

A Roll Call vote was taken. All were in favor to approve for outdoor seating, zero (0) opposed. The motion passed unanimously. This will be presented at an upcoming Village Board Meeting.

7. Reports of Plan Commissioners and Staff (includes Old Business):

Director Gadde stated no business to discuss, and added the Comprehensive Plan project is currently two (2) months behind and there will not be a Plan Commission meeting until June.

8. Adjournment:

Chairman Backal asked for a motion to adjourn. A motion to adjourn was made by Member Foley, seconded by Member Stanly. All in favor, zero (0) opposed, the motion carried and the meeting adjourned at 8:31 p.m.

Minutes transcribed and respectfully submitted by Gia Cassin.

Gia Cassin (Plan Commission Secretary): ________________

Approved (Date): ________________

7-14-2020
Public Comments and Questions regarding the Public Hearing for the
Bell Tower Plaza
As of May 7, 2020

From: [Redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, May 6, 2020 1:22 PM
To: [Redacted]
Subject: Bell Tower Plaza, Case No. HG-2002-V Public Hearing May 7, 2020

May 6, 2020

Dear Plan Commissioners,

Item Title: Consider for Approval a Variance to Section 75-56(D) of the Outdoor Lighting Regulations for the parking lot light improvements at 15750 S. Bell Road, Homer Glen, Illinois [Bell Tower Plaza, Case No. HG-2002-V].

I object to the aforementioned variance request for the following reasons: The lighting is exceptionally brighter than all adjacent properties, the CCT is almost double than what is allowed, especially the wall packs at 5700 CCT. A significant amount of the luminaires are not positioned to be fully shielded and installed in the proper orientation to achieve fully shielded performance with respect to a horizontal plane. I am unable to quantify the lumens per acre in the photometric plan and luminaire schedule. I am sympathetic to the additional costs that may be incurred by the applicant but the applicant should have exercised due diligence with respect to the codes of the Village before beginning this project.

Specifically regarding Applicants submission, I have the following questions and concerns:

Page 3: Regarding Section (75-56) (A) Fully Shielded Requirement

Applicant: It was found that due to the locations of the existing poles, there were inadequate light levels directly in front of the building.

CR: 1) Lighting levels, uniformity, etc. are the responsibility of the owner, and not regulated by the village lighting ordinance

2) The CCT of the light has no bearing on the illumination level produced, whatever the pole spacing.

3) If the light poles are improperly placed to achieve the owner’s desired illumination levels, the poles should be relocated or light fixtures with different distribution patterns should be chosen. The limitations created by trying to preserve legacy hardware is a limitation created by the choice of the property owner to limit costs – and not a limitation unusual to this property on the appropriateness of the Villages lighting code standards. This is a self-imposed hardship and not the fault of the Village or the Village's ordinances.
Plan Commission

May 7, 2020

Page 4: 1(b) That the plight of the owner is due to unique circumstances.
Applicant: With this originally constructed prior to the ordinance being in place, there would be inadequate and unsafe light levels for this environment without substantial financial burden.

CR: See above

1(c) That the variance, if granted, will not alter the essential character of the locality.
Applicant: The adjacent properties are similar in color to the 5000k.

CR: Non-conformance of adjacent properties is not a valid claim for "altering the essential character of the locality". Non-compliance of the property at issue, regarding CCT or lumen totals or any standards of the Village Code, is a self-created hardship and violation of Village standards. Again, it's relation to adjacent non-conforming properties is not a valid claim to maintain "essential character of the locality."

Adjacent properties, if non-conforming, is a legal condition. Non-conformance of any other property is not relevant to the request for a variance. Anyone can remain non-conforming as long as they do not change their lighting. The property in question is now non-compliant – that is an illegal condition, created by changing lights without permit.

3. (a) That the particular surroundings, shape, or topographical conditions of the specific property involved will bring a particular hardship upon the owner, as distinguished from a mere inconvenience, if the strict letter of the regulations was carried out.
Applicant: As stated, the financial burden would be tremendous. Additionally, full cutoff wall packs set significantly from the road, would not allow the amount of appropriate light in front of the stores.

CR: Note the standard variance terminology – "particular surroundings, shape, or topographical conditions... bring a particular hardship." Note hardships created by existing property improvements such as light poles and their placement are not recognized in law as valid grounds for granting a variance. If fully-shielded (or full-cut off) fixtures located on the building do not provide adequate lighting to meet the owner's needs, a different lighting design may be necessary. This is the responsibility of the owner, and not the Village.

Page 5: 3(b) That the conditions upon which the petition for variance is based would not be applicable, generally, to other property within the same zoning classification.
Applicant: If this project was done in smaller phases, this project would be complying as lighting maintenance is this truly was.

CR: This is irrelevant, the project was not done in phases.

3(d) That the alleged difficulty or hardship has not been created by any person presently having an interest in the property.

Applicant: It is the contractor who would field the burden of the required changes.

CR: If plumbing or electrical codes were violated the contractor would also need to rectify the problems. The contract/applicant is not allowed to pick and chose which Village laws must be followed.
3(e) That the granting of the variance will not be detrimental to the public welfare or unduly injurious to other property or improvements in the neighborhood in which the property is located.

Applicant: It is felt that the system installed greatly improved the environment and was designed professionally with the intent to do so.

**CR:** What is and is not detrimental to the public welfare is defined by the duly-enacted laws and ordinances of the Village, including the lighting code. What the applicant feels or does not feel is not germane to the public welfare.

3(f) That the exterior architectural appeal and functional plan of any proposed structure will not be so at Variance with the exterior architectural appeal and functional plan of the structures already constructed, or in the course of construction in the immediate neighborhood or the character of the applicable district, as to cause a substantial depreciation in the property values within the neighborhood.

Applicant: Appeal of the property was improved.

**CR:** Per what source?

**CR:** In regard to the photometric plan and luminaire schedule:

The photometric plan is confusing. One section of the plan has a note that reads "revise to 35w" for nine of the wall pack luminaires. Is this current or future tense? The luminaire schedule reads 80w for the wall packs.

The photometric is incomplete. The plan shows fixture E with two luminaires in the southeast corner, this fixture is not on the luminaire schedule, so I am unable to determine the lumens per acre.

The luminaire schedule is incomplete. The schedule does not list the luminaire manufacturer and part numbers for each type of luminaire. There is no CCT listed for the parking lot luminaires.

Sincerely,

Cynthia Rataj

Homer Glen, IL 60491
From: [Redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, May 6, 2020 10:02 PM
To: [Redacted]
Cc: [Redacted]

Subject: Plan Commission Meeting 4-6-2020 Bell Tower Plaza 15750 S. Bell Rd. Case No, HG-2002-V Parking Lot Lighting Concerns Submission Letter

Bell Tower Plaza 15750 S. Bell Rd. Case No, HG-2002-V

Plan Commission Meeting-April 16th. Concerns for HG Lighting Status/Changes

If the Plan Commission votes in a positive way for the property owner, the consequences are severe. That means that they are voting for light pollution, increased lighting and brightness and against all that the Outdoor Lighting Ordinance requires and that of what being a Dark Sky Community means.

Being designated as a Dark Sky Community is an honor and distinction that few towns have worldwide. Homer Glen is known throughout the world for being a Dark Sky Community.

The property owner states that he did not know he was required to get a permit.
Since any government has laws that are required to be followed such as those like a state, county or municipalities, is it not true that ignorance of the law is not an excuse for waiving any guilt? Therefore, if laws are not followed, the individuals are still guilty.

The Outdoor Lighting Ordinance does not allow for variances of this kind and the request of this variance should not be sought or be encouraged to be granted

If the Village grants the property owner who is the guilty party, the variance, the Village is then encouraging others to do the same. The Outdoor Lighting Ordinance is thoroughly weakened and can be taken advantage of in the future.

RESPONSE TO VARIANCE FACTORS
Variance Factor Item 1.a.
As written, it reads ---- "The property in question cannot yield a reasonable return if permitted to be used only under the conditions allowed by the regulations in that zone. Answer: with the existing infrastructure being as it is, and the fixtures being already installed at 5000K, the cost to modify would be in excess of $30,000"

The property owner says that it would take $30,000 to comply. He needs TO PROVE that it would cost that much. There is a way to alter the Kelvin and Watts to comply. It should be done.

That property has not been greatly improved but "greatly altered". In fact, the property as it now exists has nuisance lighting. It has not been so-called ------ "improved".

Variance Factor Item 1.b.:
It reads: “The plight of the owner is due to unique circumstances.” Answer: “With this originally constructed prior to the ordinance being in place, there would be inadequate and unsafe light levels for this environment without substantial financial burden.

Is this believable? Because there is not proof that this property had been unsafe over a long period of decades.

Variance Factor Item 1.c.
It says: “That the variance, if granted, will not alter the essential character of the locality.” Answer: “The adjacent properties are similar in color to the 5000K.”

Are the adjacent properties similar in color?
That should be challenged since the unapproved lighting at 5000 K CCT has already altered the character of the property. The increased lighting is negatively affecting residential properties at a great distance. It is also emitting glare which is one of the important reasons that the Outdoor Lighting Ordinance prevents.

Variance Item 3. a.
It states: That the particular surroundings, shape, or topographical conditions of the specific property involved will bring a particular hardship upon the owner, ......etc. Answer: the Financial burden would be tremendous.... etc.

The $30,000 burden should be investigated and corrected to a much lower cost with some other ideas rather than a “complete overhaul”. There is a way to prove that the burden does not have to be $30,000 and it should be tried.

Item 3. b.
It reads: That the conditions upon which the petition for variance is based would not be applicable.... etc. Answer: If this project was done in smaller phases, this project would be complying.... as lighting maintenance.

Whether done all at once as it was done or in phases, this project would not have complied and the extreme changes cannot be considered purely maintenance.

Item 3. c.
It reads: That the purpose of the variance is not exclusively based upon a desire to make more money ......etc. Answer: This project only moved forward “due to the assistance of a significant Com Ed incentive...... etc.

ComEd and its grant money -- ComEd has decided that it will invade Homer Glen and over power its lighting ordinance and regulations. ComEd should be working with Homer Glen if they wish to help the commercial property owners. Is 5000 K CCT a requirement in their grant?

Item 3. d.
It reads: That the alleged difficulty or hardship has not been created by any person presently having an interest in the property. Answer: It is the contractor who would field the burden...... etc.

The hardship has been created by the owner of this property and in a way that is self -inflicting.
It is possible that changing bulbs or sockets would bring the fixtures into compliance. That should be investigated and would be a much less costly fix.

Item 3. e.
It reads: *That the granting of the variance will not be detrimental to the public welfare, unduly injurious .... etc.* Answer: *It is felt that the system installed greatly improved the environment and was designed professionally .... etc.*

The property has not been improved and was designed without approval. The changes are detrimental because of the egregious increase in lighting, brightness, and glare. The public has also reacted very negatively and contacted the Village about the problems they have endured because of these changes.

Item 3. f.
It reads: *That the exterior architectural appeal and functional plan of any proposed structure......etc.* Answer: *Appeal of the property was improved.*

The action at Bell Tower Plaza is being called an ‘improvement’ which it is not because of the negative factors that have been created.

Item 3. g.
It reads: *That the proposed variance will not impair an adequate supply of air to adjacent property, substantially increase the danger of fire, public safety, substantially diminish or impair .... Answer: No impairment was created.*

It does endanger the Public Safety and Quality of Life. Over-lighting and glare have been known to cause accidents.

Sincerely,
Margaret Sabo
Former Homer Glen Trustee  2001 to 2015
Environment Committee Member
From: [Redacted]  
Sent: Wednesday, May 6, 2020 7:38 PM  
To: [Redacted]  
Subject: Lighting

Acceptable for public hearing.

The lighting in question is for the Bell Tower Plaza.  
The issue is that ComEd wants to see energy reducing LED type lamps.

The LED lights being proposed are 5000K LED lamps.

The recommendation proposed by the Dark Sky Association along with the Homer Glen Environment Committee would be for 2200K LED/PC Amber.  
This lamp would be the closest equivalent to the current HPS lamp and still offer the energy reduction of an LED type lamp.

Randy Juras  
Homer Glen, Illinois

From: [Redacted]  
Sent: Tuesday, May 5, 2020 2:40 PM  
To: [Redacted]  
Subject: Plan Commission meeting

Hello Mr. Vjay Gadde:

I would like to PLEASE express my concerns about the present 5000K lights on the Bell Tower parking lot. Our ordinance requires 3000 Kelvin. I would kindly like to request to have them changed. Thank you,

Cordially, Joseph Turrise
From: [Redacted]
Sent: Tuesday, May 5, 2020 12:41 PM
To: Gia Cassin <[Redacted]>
Subject: Plan Commission May 7-Lighting

Good afternoon Gia,

I have been fielding complaints in my HOA about the bright light emanating from the shopping areas on the west and east side of Bell Rd. just north of 159th st. Some specific complaints were leveled at the dialysis center, but the area overall with Nicks, Stock & Field, Chesdan on the West side, and the Dialysis center south to 159th on the east side combine to light up the sky in an aesthetically unpleasing and distracting way in the evenings for our community, especially when standing at the south of our lake and looking towards the intersection where these stores and lighting exist.

We are strongly in favor of adhering to our Village ordinances with no variances, and desire lower wattage amber colored lighting - shielded lighted pointed down where possible.

Many of our neighbors have enjoyed views to the night sky unmarred by excessive lighting for decades, and we wish to move forward with any commercial development with responsible lighting compliant with our Dark Sky initiative.

Let me know if there is any action required of me to speak on behalf of our HOA.

Sincerely,
Andrew Panelli – President
Deboer Woods Homeowners Association
Hello, My name is Cynthia Saenger, I live at [redacted] Homer Glen. We moved here in 2013 and couldn't be happier. My husband and I have 3 young children 8, 10 and 14. I am writing you with the concern of a new business they are opening about 20 feet from my back yard. It is a Bar called Mugshots. My family has been through some trying times these past few years. My daughter [redacted] just got over a battle with Cancer. Lymphoma..... she has had a rough go the past few years. (The Town of Homer Glen was and is AMAZING the support everyone gave us is so humbling) And before this my husband has had a Major Heart Attack that nearly killed him called the Widow Maker and now has a pace maker and defibrillator in his chest at 44. I come from a Family of Bar Owners. My parents own a bar in Hickory Hills, My Brother Owns a bar in Palos Heights and My other Brother owns a bar in Rockford. So I am writing to you to see if there is anything we can do about the Zoning they are requesting for an outdoor Seating Area. As this will definitely affect our little strip of homes. We love to sit in our yard and swim, BBQ, Hang with neighbors and I feel the last thing the QUIET town of Homer glen Needs is an out door area of people Eating Drinking and SMOKING right outside my backyard and the backyard of a few other homes. I get that these guys want a Booming Bar Business..... My Family was all about it as I said they own bars I manage a Bar! However what they are asking to do so close to community homes and out in the open can and will affect many of us. Especially the health of my family or any of my wonderful neighbors..... the last thing any of us needs is added noise and pollution from Cigarettes, Cigars or Marijuana! I am very concerned!!!. Its bad enough we will have constant traffic now in and out and for God knows how early into the morning hours possibly 2 a.m. But they need to consider the family neighborhood they are so close to. With children. Families that need sleep to work the next day Etcetera. I tell you of the health issues my daughter and husband have because they are doing ok now but extra pollutions from this place and Smoke from people smoking outside will affect them. Not to mention we have to already deal with the smell of Dumpsters out back and junk these business owners have thrown out their back doors and into our view. Don't get me wrong I understand We bought this house knowing there is a strip mall behind it. But NEVER in a Million Years did I think we would
have a Loud Noisey BAR in out yard. This is the area of the old village hall. Had normal and decent business hours an closed on weekends. This is all going to change for us and a few others that this new Bar Mugshots is not considering. I ask that you please direct me in some way how I can help this out door zoning not happen. Myself and some other neighbors have received a letter about Case No HG-2003-s for a meeting April 2nd. Which I don’t think will happen now due to the Covid-19 Lockdown but I am very concerned. I get they want a Bar and Pub there and that’s going to be bad enough til 2 am. But an outdoor area will be Aweful for these young family’s to have to put up with. I Love Homer Glen and I am so happy we decided to move here and I don’t want to Move ever! I am so sad that this is even an option for these guys. Ok thank you for reading. I hope you and your family is well. Stay safe sorry to bother you with something that may NOT seem like that big of an issue right now but it weighs on my heart as a Mother and Wife and Resident and as I said I bartend I know the bar industry and I am not OK with this at all. It will affect us in a big way Believe Me I KNOW ok Thank You Again for reading. Stay Healthy and let me know How We can make our voices heard as the hearing will be cancelled now I’m sure!
Take Care!

Sincerely
Cynthia Saenger