

ADDITIONAL PUBLIC COMMENTS FOR APPEAL CASE NO. PAPP-004330-2024

Public comment period was March 9, 2025 through March 19, 2025

Public hearing: March 19, 2025, 5 p.m.

What follows are public comments received after the Planning Commission hearing concluded on March 19, 2025.

List of commenters:

M. Graves

J. Kendall

Comments from the Public

From: Josh Kendall

Sent: Wednesday, March 19, 2025 11:39 PM

To: Lamberg, Alan

Subject: No Banquet Hall

We already have too many drivers flying down Patterson all day long.

*it is already congested at the pacific / Burchett intersection.

*Drivers already illegally park at the Starbucks and down the street.

*my street "Patterson" is already full of litter and cigarette butts from the daily gatherings of our many careless users of the park and parking lot.

*there are already too many banquet halls in the area...do we really need another?

*I will not tolerate cars being parked up and down my block and loud noise from careless patrons of the banquet hall every other evening when the parking lot is full.

*let's be honest, this is just another criminal who is going to be laundering money thru the banquet hall. Let's put a stop to this bullshit.

From: Mardy Graves

Sent: Tuesday, March 25, 2025 12:57 PM

To: Planning Commission

Cc: Lamberg, Alan Ezzati, Vista

Subject: Follow up to Appeal of CUP for Banquet Hall at 707 N. Pacific, Glendale, Ca.

Dear Commissioners and Staff,

I want to thank you for listening to our concerns and allowing everyone to speak at the meeting last Wednesday! However, I was surprised that when the motion was made to reject the appellant's appeal, the only new condition was that the applicant should allow up to 12 parking spaces for neighbors to use Monday through Friday from 8:00 AM to 5:00 PM! I know that this did not pass as it required three votes, but I am surprised that some additional conditions were not suggested! These concerns came from all three Commissioners who were present, from speakers and several callers as well. Many concerns were not addressed in the applicant's original conditions.

These include :

There were concerns about insufficient parking with no overflow plans presented except for a call in speaker who had talked to the owner of the Escrow building at 516 Burchett. He said that he had spoken to the owner of this building who said that he would not allow his parking lot to be leased.(In a letter from the Assets Manager of this building, written before the first hearing, it was said that the owner rejected the idea of EVER leasing his parking lot.)There was discussion about clarifying the issue of insufficient parking at the next meeting, but this was not in the motion.

There was no information on where staff, including security and valet parking attendants would park. There was insufficient information on whether the occupancy of 263 included staff, security and valet personnel, and , therefore, how many parking spaces would really be needed!

Current conditions of use specify that employees, valet staff and visitors are prohibited from parking along residential streets or in the Fremont Park lots. We also have no idea how the reopening of Fremont Park with its expanded facilities will affect this situation! In addition to this, we now have the issue of a proposed drive through at the site of the Acapulco restaurant which is right across the street from the proposed Banquet Hall. The City Council received more than 100 emails and dozens of speakers from our neighborhood and adjacent areas who spoke out in opposition to this proposed drive through project! Even though this project is not part of the CUP, it will, undoubtedly, affect the applicant's business and have a very negative impact on the quality of our lives!

There was insufficient information on stack parking and how a car in the middle could be moved if the owners left early. How will the Banquet Hall be sure that no one parks in the neighborhoods around the establishment, including Burchett, Hahn, Patterson, Kenilworth, Arden, etc? Will security be responsible for asking people where they parked when they walk into the lot? Will it be up to the neighbors to report them? I have been the Neighborhood Watch Block Captain for many years, so this issue is of particular importance to me!

The applicant's new plans call for a west facing outdoor valet waiting area for people waiting for their cars. This raises new concerns including the possible elimination of some parking spaces and an outside gathering place not protected from late night noise and smoking!

If , by some chance, the parking lot at 516 Burchett was leased to accommodate the overflow of parking, the entire block would be negatively impacted by noise , headlights shining into neighbor's homes, loud talking, etc at 2:00 or 3:00 AM !

How does an immediate application of AB 2097 apply when the BRT will not be completed for approximately three years?

The Planning Hearing Officer has a renovation clause:
Section 30.64.020, Revocation- The Community Development Department shall have continuing jurisdiction over the Conditional Use Permits. Failure to abide by or fully comply with any and all conditions attached to, or made part of, this Conditional Use Permit constitutes grounds for its revocation.To consider the revocation, the Director of Community Development shall hold a public hearing after giving notice by the same procedure as for consideration of a Conditional Use Permit, at least ten(10) days' notice by mail to the applicant or permittee.

We have a question about this clause. If the applicant does not follow all of the conditions in the PHO decision and any new ones the Planning Commission puts on the project, that the applicant could lose the CUP. Is this correct?

Because of the many concerns that have not been discussed or addressed as well as the new information that was given in last week's hearing, I strongly recommend that the Commission allow a full revisit / redo of our session. I definitely believe that all of the items above should be discussed, and if a new motion is made to reject the appeal, that some or all of our concerns will be addressed in the new motion!

On a personal note, I have been walking around our neighborhood and MANY adjacent areas for several months, including all of the businesses on Pacific, Kenilworth and Glenoaks that are close to our neighborhood, and absolutely everyone that I have spoken to has been upset, and very much against this project. Many people have expressed anger, disbelief, disappointment, confusion and great sadness in regards to this project. Several have said that it is sad to think that the city seems to me more interested in expanding their tax base than the safety and welfare of its citizens! This has been physically exhausting and emotionally depleting! BUT, it has been encouraging and uplifting to talk to people who are still willing to work together to keep our neighborhoods safe and secure!

Thank you for your consideration of this matter!

Sincerely,
Mardy Graves
Neighborhood Watch Block Captain and member of of the Coalition of Community Members
Supporting the Appeal