

EXHIBIT 6

PUBLIC COMMENTS FOR CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT CASE NO. PCUP-003300-2024

Public comment period was November 25, 2024 through December 4, 2024

Public hearing was December 4, 2024

Decision was rendered December 12, 2024

List of commenters:

By email:

D. Bogosian

S. Farrell

J. Fieda

A. Flemming

M. Graves

Christine King

Cynthia King

R. Mersola

K. Middlebrooks

H. Mosesi

H. Sardarbegian

Harvey (no last name given)

“Pacific/Burchett Resident” (name withheld)

By phone:

R. Friedman

V. Pallos

S. Schauer

Comments from the Appellant

On Sunday, November 24, 2024 at 02:04:19 PM PST, Adam Flemming wrote:

Hi Alan

I've been a homeowner directly across from 707 N Pacific for 13 years. The proposal for conditional use permit no. PCUP-003300-2024/admin use permit no. PAUP-044144-2024 is of great concern to our small community. This is not zoned as an 'entertainment' lot, it is a retail facility. The proposal indicates a major outdoor component to the venue which will affect noise and community disruption. The property borders our residential zone, its only access is via this residential street. Our block of Burchett has multi-generational families and children, including my direct neighbor with a newborn. The proposal indicates an exception for its under-supported parking lot. The soon to be expanded facilities of Fremont park's remodel will increase dependance on block parking as well as a significant increase in multigenerational patrons. Our park offers established highly successful daytime and evening programs. These indicate hazards to pedestrians. Risk of an establishment where a lcohol is a central factor has huge implications on a community that has long been struggling with speeding, car noise, littering, and gang activity. When the RiteAid proposal was being assessed by the city, considerations were made limiting its business hours and hours for disruptive restocking services. Acknowledgment of this being a private residential district already has precedent in the planning councils decisions. Can you expand on the regulations being assigned on the proposed tenant which maintain a safe and balanced environment for our established community? Thanks -Adam Flemming
511 Burchett 91203

-----Original Message-----

From: Adam Flemming

Sent: Tuesday, November 26, 2024 1:38 PM

To: Lamberg, Alan

Subject: Re: 707 N Pacific

Hi Alan

Following up with several clearer defined concerns/questions, especially in light of the exempt environmental impact report:

*Lack of adequate parking defined in the permits - reliance on surface street/private neighborhood parking for over 5/6s of the venue's capacity. Are Burchett and surrounding streets to be adapted to metered, permit-only, or a timed permit-only district?

*Curfew zoning between immediately adjacent C2.2 and R1.2 districts - what will tenants guidelines be for business hours and noise/disruption restrictions during operation? Will there be additional restrictions for non-operation service hours?

*Is expanded police patrol/security to be required/provided in area?

Your team's response is appreciated. Thank you

-Adam Flemming

511 Burchett 91203

On Wednesday, November 27, 2024 at 01:21:06 PM PST, Lamberg, Alan:

Good afternoon, Adam Flemming. Thank you for contacting the Glendale Planning Division about 707 N Pacific Ave.

This is regarding an application for a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) to establish a banquet hall with entertainment, and an Administrative Use Permit (AUP) for the on-site sales, service and consumption of alcoholic beverages. The project includes an AB-2097 parking exception to allow 50 in lieu of 243 required off-street parking spaces. Case numbers PCUP-003300-2024 & PAUP-004144-2024.

I appreciate that you shared your perspective as a resident of the Fremont Park neighborhood.

I understand that your concerns primarily address the issues of residential impact, zoning and noise issues, parking problems, and neighborhood safety and disruption.

I will share your comments with the planning hearing officer who will consider this application. As a courtesy, this is my brief response as the case planner:

- * The site is zoned for a banquet hall with accessory alcohol sales, service and consumption.
- * A business that provides live entertainment is subject to standards in GMC Title 5 Business Licenses and Regulations.
- * Outdoor activities will be constrained within certain site improvements with limited hours and noise level not to exceed what is allowed by Noise Control (GMC Chapter 8.36). *Conditions of approval require the applicant, owner, and/or on-site manager, with security staff, to be responsible to*
- * prevent loitering, trespassing, and any other illegal or criminal activity, and
- ** to provide appropriate on-site and off-site parking and traffic circulation.
- * Other comments pertaining to the Fremont Park, curfew (regarding minors or persons under the age of 18?), and previous tenant (Rite Aid) did not necessarily pertain to the project under discussion.

The issues above were addressed in the staff report, draft findings of fact, and draft conditions of approval for consideration by the planning hearing officer.

The Planning Hearing Officer meeting on this case is scheduled for Wednesday, December 4th at 9:30 a.m.

Agenda and Staff Report

- 1 Visit the Glendale Public Meeting Portal: [Public Meeting Portal | City of Glendale, CA](#)
- 2 Find the "Planning Hearing Officer" for the date of the meeting.
- 3 Click "HTML Agenda" and a new window will open.
- 4 Scroll to and click anywhere on the agenda item to view the staff report and exhibits: [Meeting](#)

At the meeting there will be an opportunity for public comments in support of or in opposition to the application.

Later, the decision will be prepared in writing and posted on the city's internet site. I will notify you by email when that decision is available.

Respectfully,
Alan Lamberg, AICP | Planner | City of Glendale
633 E. Broadway, Room 103 | Glendale, CA | 818-937-8158

From: Adam Flemming
Sent: Sunday, December 1, 2024 10:37 PM
To: Lamberg, Alan
Subject: Re: response to comment RE: 707 N Pacific

Hi Alan

Thanks for your responses. Please share the additional information with the committee:

Glendale city Noise Ordinance expressly prohibits establishment of *new* banquet halls within 200 feet of any residential dwellings. For reference: my property line is less than 90' from the building itself. Mine included there are 16 private home R1.2 properties which are within the 200' boundary of the 707 N. Pacific C2.2 tract. Alternatively, limitations must be placed on any *existing* facilities currently operating within those overlap zones such as limited business hours, noise and disturbance reduction, and traffic mitigation. Even if the council somehow justifies this adaptive use is permissible, it is compulsory its operation must be governed by our cities regulation. The conditional use permit - the catalyst from which all efforts to convert the facility are dependent on - specifically cites the permit cannot violate any environmental factors or general welfare. See below excerpts:

Glendale Conditional Use Permits – 12/01/2024

Chapter 30.42.030

“Findings of fact. A conditional use permit shall be granted only if the review authority first finds that each of the following exists:”

“B. That the use and its associated structures and facilities will not be detrimental to the public health or safety, the general welfare, or the environment.”

Glendale Noise Element with cover for City Council 51707 – 06/05/2007

Section 2.2.4, p09

“Noise Ordinance. The most effective method to control community noise impacts from non-transportation noise sources is through application of the Community Noise Ordinance. The City of Glendale has a strong, enforceable Noise Ordinance. The Noise Ordinance is designed to protect quiet residential areas from stationary noise sources. The noise levels encouraged by the ordinance are typical of a quiet residential area. It should be noted that while some noise problems are resolved through measurements and code enforcement actions, there are some problems that are best addressed through some form of mediation program”

Exhibit 8, p32

“Banquet Facilities Interface with Residences. Banquet facilities have several sources of noise. Generally, the parking lots associated with the facilities are the most significant source of noise.

Cars driving into and out of the lots, groups of people talking and shouting, and inadvertent car alarms can all occur in the parking lot and can occur late at night when the banquet ends. Music is often played at the banquet facilities and has the potential for being a problem in the surrounding area when doors and windows are left open. The City does not allow banquet facilities within 200 feet of a residential zone. Limiting hours and requiring onsite parking away from residential areas are other planning restrictions that can be used. Banquet facilities that are currently operating can be controlled via the Noise Ordinance. The Noise Ordinance has very specific noise level limits that are measured at the nearby residential property line. The Noise Ordinance limitations apply to all noise generated at the banquet facilities including parking lot noise. The Noise Ordinance limitations are more stringent after 10 p.m., so nighttime noise is controlled to a greater extent than noise generated during the evening. Since the Noise Ordinance is in place and can be used to effectively control banquet facility noise, no action items or changes to policy are recommended.”

Additionally as an fyi to the council tangentially relevant to the case: the proposed tenant or owner has engaged in substantial interior construction efforts to the property. Multiple residents of Burchett have observed/documented crews entering and exiting the building. Demolition of all interior structures leveraging jackhammers, professional backhoe equipment, and hauling of debris from the facility has been ongoing daily throughout November. Crews were observed on property and heard jackhammering over the observed holiday of 11/25 and 11/26. A ticket submitted to building and safety inspections through MyGlendale (ID#4739398) was rerouted to neighborhood services (request #PV-0436-01-2024).

Thanks

From: Lamberg, Alan
Sent: Monday, December 2, 2024 11:26 AM
To: Adam Flemming
Subject: RE: response to comment RE: 707 N Pacific

I will ensure that your comments are received by the Planning Hearing Officer.

From: Adam Flemming
Sent: Thursday, December 12, 2024 8:06 PM
To: Lamberg, Alan
Cc: Mardy Graves, Cynthia King
Subject: Re: Decision letters for 707 N Pacific Ave

Hi Alan

Thank you for forwarding the case decisions. During the hearing, officer Babakhani referenced recommended hours of business operation in the council's conditions of approval.

She noted a 1a recommendation acknowledged the special circumstances in the area which they're proposing the banquet hall in. I am not finding indication in the approvals of any time restriction beyond governing of alcohol sales. Was this omitted from the conditions or do any application of operating hours appear in a different set of documents?

-Adam Flemming
511 Burchett 91203

Comments from the Public

From: Print Harvey
Sent: Thursday, November 28, 2024 3:39 PM
To: Lamberg, Alan
Subject: 707 N. Pacific to establish a banquet hall

My name is Harvey and I have been living on 500 block of Burchett st. since 1989.

I am very concern of this business moving to this area, including traffic, parking issue, serving alcohol, noise late at night . . .

Do I or any other home owners have the right to object ?
If YES , do you think our objection will play any role in stoping them?
BTW
Why is it Conditional Use permit?

Why the project using AB-2097 parking exception?

please comment

Thank You
Harvey

-----Original Message-----

From: Kathleen Middlebrooks
Sent: Monday, December 2, 2024 8:12 AM
To: Lamberg, Alan
Subject: Meeting for 707 N. Pacific Ave. - APN 5636-016-061

Good Morning Mr. Lamberg,

I received a green card in the mail regarding the meeting set for 707 N. Pacific Ave. I have several concerns about this new facility that I would like to have addressed at the meeting.

1. Traffic congestion: has a study been done on the effects of the traffic in this area, especially on and off the freeway? What will the effects be on that intersection. Also the traffic congestion that will occur once the park is opened next year?
2. What will the effects be for emergency vehicles that have to come down on Hahn Ave. Hahn is designated as an emergency thoroughfare. However, this is also a one-way street and if it's blocked up, what are the effects of drive time for an emergency call?
3. Noise issues: what are the hours of operation? It says that there is an outdoor seating area so the noise late at night is a concern.
4. Occupancy load - can you clarify what the indoor and outdoor occupancy is expected to be?

These are some basic questions I would like to have answered. My concern is also that we have this park opening at the end of Burchett and Hahn so we have yet to discover what the traffic congestion will be once the full Soccer court, Pickleball courts, and tennis courts are being used at full capacity. The question is will the banquet hall and the park constantly be competing for parking.

I appreciate your looking into this and answering my questions. Please feel free to call me on my cell if you need more information regarding my questions. You can reach me at 818-421-7049.

Sincerely,
Kathleen Middlebrooks

From: Rob Mersola
Sent: Monday, December 2, 2024 4:25 PM
To: Lamberg, Alan
Subject: 707 N Pacific Ave Project

This is Rob Mersola, 24 year owner and resident of 519 Burchett St and owner and landlord of 517 Burchett St and 530 & 532 Hahn Ave.

I'm writing with concerns about the proposed Banquet Hall at 707 N. Pacific. My main concerns regard noise and parking.

My house, along with 5 other homes are directly across the street from this possible venue and noise past 10pm would greatly disrupt the neighborhood, including my tenants, to whom I would like to ensure a peaceful neighborhood. Drunken patrons leaving the venue late at night would also be loud and disruptive to the neighborhood.

Parking has always been an issue on our very small block. I don't know what the proposed occupancy allowance is set for in the venue, however I do know that there are only 58 parking spaces in the lot at 707. Any spill over will become quite an issue for our very limited street parking.

I've also read in the proposal about an outdoor patio and deck with live entertainment. Again, this will become a very disruptive noise issue for the residents in the neighborhood. This will all be taking place mere feet from many resident's front doors.

I know that most of my neighbors have these same concerns. Some of whom will attend the public hearing (I will not be able to attend, which is why I'm writing you here).

I do hope you take into consideration the neighborhood and actual people who live here when making your decision. At the very least, **a 10pm noise ordinance, an occupancy allowance that reflects the available parking, and a restriction on outdoor entertaining.**

Thanks for your consideration,

Rob Mersola
Events Manager
Geffen Playhouse

From: Cynthia King
Sent: Monday, December 2, 2024 9:31 PM
To: Lamberg, Alan
Subject: Conditional Use Permit (CUP) Application PCUP-003300-2024 and Administrative Use Permit (AUP) PAUP-004144-2024

Re: Opposition to Conditional Use Permit (CUP) Application PCUP-003300-2024 and Administrative Use Permit (AUP) PAUP-004144-2024

We are writing to express our strong opposition to the proposed Conditional Use Permit (CUP) and Administrative Use Permit (AUP) for 707 N Pacific Ave to establish a banquet hall with live entertainment and on-site alcohol sales. As third-generation homeowners in the Fremont Park neighborhood, with children and grandchildren currently living in our home, we are deeply concerned about the negative impact this project will have on the surrounding community. The proposed banquet hall raises several issues that are incompatible with the residential character of our neighborhood:

1. Parking Deficiency and Traffic Congestion

The request for a parking exception allowing only 50 spaces instead of the 243 required is unacceptable. This significant shortfall will exacerbate parking congestion in the area, forcing event attendees to use residential streets, which are already overburdened. Increased traffic from the banquet hall, particularly during evening and late-night events, will create unsafe conditions for residents and pedestrians, including children and seniors.

2. Noise and Disruption

Despite assurances regarding noise control and limited hours, live entertainment and alcohol service will likely result in noise levels that disrupt the peace of our residential neighborhood. Noise from outdoor activities, amplified music, and large gatherings is

difficult to contain, particularly in a mixed-use area. Residents should not have to endure the persistent disruption caused by an entertainment venue.

3. **Safety and Security Concerns**

The sale and consumption of alcohol, coupled with live entertainment, increase the likelihood of loitering, trespassing, and other disturbances. Even with proposed security measures, a venue of this type introduces risks of intoxicated individuals disturbing the neighborhood, damaging property, or engaging in illegal activity.

4. **Impact on Neighborhood Quality of Life**

Our neighborhood is a family-oriented, residential community. The introduction of a high-traffic commercial venue with alcohol sales and live entertainment is incompatible with this environment. Residents have the right to enjoy a safe, quiet, and peaceful community.

While we understand that the site is zoned for commercial use, the scale and nature of this proposed project are not appropriate for the Fremont Park area. I urge the Planning Hearing Officer to carefully consider the concerns of the community and deny the CUP and AUP applications.

Thank you for your attention to this matter. We plan to attend the hearing on Wednesday and would welcome the opportunity to testify. We would appreciate it if you could confirm receipt of these written comments.

PLease feel free to contact Cynthia King if there is any further information that you can provide or if you have any questions or require further information from us.

Sincerely,

Cynthia and Christine King
503 Burchett St.
Glendale, CA 91203

From: David Bogosian
Sent: Tuesday, December 3, 2024 4:49 AM
To: Lamberg, Alan
Subject: 707 North Pacific

I am a resident on Burchett St, about 1/4 mile west of the proposed development. Our access to the freeway is regularly via this portion of Burchett St which opens onto Pacific; we often cross that intersection going east towards downtown Glendale. I have resided here for 36 years and am deeply vested in this community.

I am opposed to the creation of a banquet hall at this location. It should be obvious to city planners that:

- a) there are too many of these establishments already
- b) they lead to traffic and noise issues for nearby residents, especially in a situation like this where there are residences within a few feet
- c) they use residential streets for valet parking, but the streets in the immediate vicinity are very narrow, have multi-unit housing, and are already choked up with no parking available
- d) there is a small probability of increased violent crime

I hope your office will take its responsibilities seriously and deny the application.

Sincerely,
David Bogosian
666 Burchett St

From: HRACHIK Sardarbegian
Sent: Tuesday, December 3, 2024 4:23 PM
To: Lamberg, Alan Asatryan, Elen Najarian, Ara Kassakhian, Ardashes Brotman, Daniel Gharpetian, Vartan
Subject: 707 N Pacific

Dear Mr. Alan Lamberg and Glendale City Council:

I am writing to express my deep concern and objection to the proposed banquet hall at 707 N. Pacific Avenue. As a resident of the neighborhood for over 30 years, I have serious reservations and opposition about the potential impact this development will have on our community.

The proposed location, although has an official address on Pacific Avenue, it actually sits on Burchett Street and has its only entry from Burchett Street, is situated within a predominantly single-family residential area. Burchett is a narrow street; when vehicles are parked on both sides of the street, only one vehicle can pass through at a time using the “middle” lane. This serene neighborhood has been a peaceful haven for families for many years. Freemont Park has served the community for decades and will only help bring in more families to enjoy the outside space. However, the influx of traffic, noise, and litter associated with the nearby Starbucks has already disrupted our quality of life.

The addition of a banquet hall would undoubtedly exacerbate these issues. The noise from amplified music, particularly after 10 PM, would be a significant disturbance to our quiet residential setting. City ordinances clearly prohibit amplified music in residential areas beyond this time, and it is unclear why an exception would be made for a commercial venue. Even if the amplified music is indoors, the noise will clearly travel to the outside space.

Furthermore, the AB-2097 parking exception, while intended to streamline business operations, raises concerns about excessive traffic and parking congestion on our streets. The potential for 193 vehicles to seek parking in our neighborhood would create a significant nuisance and safety hazard (given that from the total 243 spaces needed, the property only provides 50 spaces).

It is important to note that there is also the issue of alcohol consumption to worry about. The issue is not only the consumption of alcohol itself, but rather the loud noise from music, unruly behavior, and intoxicated individuals driving through our residential streets. We understand the desire to support local businesses and celebrate special occasions. However, it is crucial to balance these interests with the rights of residents to enjoy a peaceful and quiet neighborhood. Like most banquet halls, the business will most likely hire a valet service. The proposed valet service, while intended to alleviate parking congestion, presents another challenge: where will these 193 vehicles be parked? It is unrealistic to expect that they will not overflow onto our residential streets, further disrupting our peace.

The amazing part of our city has always been that our city prioritizes residents. We have the best police department. We have the best fire department. We have city staff that genuinely care for residence. We have parks which are constantly maintained and give our residence an opportunity to be one with nature. The neighborhood really hopes that our wellbeing and comfort is prioritized in this project as well.

I urge all City of Glendale officials, both in planning and the City Council, to carefully consider the potential number of serious negative impacts of this development and not allow the project to continue. I am pro-business and want to see Glendale thrive, however, this should not come at the expense of the quality of life, well-being and most importantly, the safety of residents.

Thank you for your time and attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Hrachik Sardarbegian

From: NAME WITHHELD

Sent: Tuesday, December 3, 2024 5:21 PM

To: Lamberg, Alan

Subject: Re: response to Pacific-Burchett Street Residence RE: 707 Glendale Pacific

Hello Alan,

I put emphasis on where I live so you can understand why it's so distressing instead of my name because that usually gets dismissed. Showing that I am a resident in this particular area is a lot more direct in my opinion. The only reason I got all of this information is because there is a thread online from the neighborhood putting up your email and voicing concern about this project. We are all frustrated and angry and it doesn't make any sense to put a "banquet" in that area. If you are guys get out of the office and walk around that area, you will see it's a tame and quiet neighborhood.

It's a peaceful for a reason, why would you plan to put something disruptive right there. Rite Aid never brought any issues there because it's a pharmacy and it closed early, by ten. It's much more than "traffic", it's what traffic brings to a tranquil neighborhood. The care goes down, people can't park, and then the safety changes. The disconnection is astounding because the residents are up in arms organizing to stop this and the planning zone can't get in touch with the actual people who live there to see what would benefit us. The rent is out of control, nothing in my building has changed, yet it's more expensive? The government really needs to find a way to connect to the locals that actual live here because the lack of awareness is frightening. Everyone is dying to survive but let's focus on a banquet that the neighborhood doesn't want and won't benefit from? Man, I hope something changes in the future because what's gonna happen next?

From: NAME WITHHELD

Sent: Tuesday, December 3, 2024 10:50 AM

To: Lamberg, Alan

Subject: 707 Glendale Pacific

Hi,

First off, how annoying. Second, absolutely not. The most frustrating thing about this notice is that the hearing is always during work hours which doesn't allow the ACTUAL LOCALS to attend, very sly and very obvious way to shun people. This is a neighborhood. This isn't downtown, or a party area. You take away the neighborhood's resources and decide "let's put a banquet in a very very very very traffic induced place and ruin the quiet that is Glendale. You guys are already bringing Erewhon and other high traffic stores, and then what? You guys are going to hike up our rent on these old buildings as if they are new condos because you guys only care about your pockets and not the actual people who LIVE HERE. I work my butt off to live here. The neighborhood is already starting to lose easy access to parking because of local businesses, and don't even TRY to convince me that that small parking lot will be enough.

That corner is already a nightmare for normal traffic days, are you truly trying to make it even worse. This location is in the center of a neighborhood. We are already extending and building the park down the literal street. What we need are more stores that have actual resources like a pharmacy because that's what the LOCALS NEED, not a loud ass banquet in the middle of a quiet street. That logic is proof that you guys don't care about us at all. Add something of value, not something that is going to irritate the people who actually have to live here everyday. As always, the government does not give two about their locals, just their pockets, even if that is literally ruining a perfectly safe and QUIET neighborhood. You guys are truly selfish. How dare you come to our neighborhood and ruin it.

WE DO NOT WANT A TRAFFIC INDUCING NIGHTMARE OR A NOISE COMPLAINT OR MORE RANDOM PEOPLE COMING INTO OUR NEIGHBORHOOD AND STEALING OUR SHIT FROM OUR CARS, OR CATALYTIC CONVERTERS, ETC ETC ETC ETC ETC ETC. DO SOMETHING ABOUT THAT BEFORE RUINING OUR QUIET AND SAFE CORNER. HELP US WITH RENT CONTROL. THESE BUILDINGS ARE OLD AS HELL AND YOU'RE TRYING TO CONVINCE US THAT OUR TINY APARTMENT ARE GOING TO BE UP TO \$3000 A MONTH IN A FEW YEARS? ARE YA'LL INSANE? OR THAT OUT OF TOUCH? WHAT A NIGHTMARE TO HAVE A GOVERNMENT COMPLETELY OUT OF TOUCH WITH IT'S RESIDENCE. GLENDALE IS QUIET FOR A REASON. WE WANT TO KEEP IT THAT WAY.

Sincerely,
Pacific/Burchett street residence. Walking distance to this corner.

From: shelby farrell
Sent: Tuesday, December 3, 2024 10:03 PM
Subject: Planning hearing 707 N Pacific

Hello Alan,

I am a resident of 426 Burchett Street which is one block away from the proposed banquet hall at 707 Pacific. I can not be at the public hearing, so I am writing you to raise my concerns about this project as described in the Public hearing notice.

Although the address for this lot is on Pacific, the main entrance for this building as well as the parking lot are on Burchett St which is residential. I obviously have concerns about the sound level from banquets as well as the potential for drunk drivers. I have small kids, and at the end of Burchett street is a large family park. So there is a high risk of accidents involving children in this area.

Additionally, waiving the parking spot requirements would mean losing all of our available street parking. There is no public lot within half a mile, and there is no street parking on Pacific. So again, Burchett St would be the default. I don't even know what lot a valet could use, should the venue provide one.

This lot used to be a pharmacy that served the families nearby. I don't think a banquet hall would serve anybody and would instead be a public annoyance in a quiet residential area.

Thank you for fielding these concerns.

Shelby Farrell

-----Original Message-----

From: Mardy Graves

Sent: Tuesday, December 3, 2024 5:20 PM

To: Lamberg, Alan

Subject: Tomorrow's Public Hearing

Dear Mr.Lamberg,

I am writing this to strongly oppose the proposed Conditional Use Permit(CUP) and the Administrative Use Permit(AUP) for 707 N. Pacific Ave. to establish a banquet hall with live entertainment and on-site alcohol sales. I have lived at 521 Burchett St.since 1968, and I have owned the property since 1978. As the Neighborhood Watch Block Captain, I am acutely aware of all of the issues we have had with traffic, parking, noise, and safety concerns over the years. As a long time resident, I am deeply concerned about the negative impact this project would have on our neighborhood and surrounding neighborhoods as well. These concerns include the following:

1. Parking- The proposal indicates an exception to its under- supported parking lot.The request for a parking exception that would allow only 50 spaces instead of of the 243 is unreasonable.There is a lack of adequate parking as defined in the permits causing a reliance on surface streets/ private and neighborhood parking.This would increase the parking congestion in an already overburdened neighborhood. Even now, people routinely block our driveways and park in red zones.

Question: Are Burchett and surrounding streets going to be changed to metered, permit only, or timed permit- only status? When Fremont Park re-opens, there will definitely be a more severe parking and flow of traffic issue! The proposal forbids any banquet hall attendees or workers to park in Fremont Park.

2. Traffic- Both Burchett and Hahn Streets have had significant traffic issues for many years. In section A of Findings and Facts, it says that the proposal use aligns with the Circulation Element by not increasing traffic levels beyond current levels. That is a totally false statement! Increased traffic from the banquet hall would create unsafe conditions for residents and pedestrians. This would include seniors and children. The proposal also states that Pacific Ave., a major arterial, can handle heavy traffic volumes, while Burchett St. supports residential needs with low traffic volumes and a wide roadway for a middle turn lane. This statement is also totally untrue. Pacific can barely handle the current level of traffic. The intersection of Pacific and Burchett is extremely dangerous because people will stop and wait for a Starbucks parking space causing traffic to back up. This happens every day despite the no stopping at any time sign. We have requested an arrow at this traffic signal, but the city has never seen fit to grant one despite the many accidents at this intersection! Burchett St. certainly does NOT have low traffic volumes and it is a very narrow street!

Question: Where would this middle turn lane be?

Noise Issues- The large outdoor areas that this project is proposing would definitely increase noise levels and community disruption. The proposal discusses using insulation features that would meet building standards, thus mitigating noise issues. There is no reference to the outdoor areas which would, obviously, increase noise and disruption to the neighborhood. Other sources of noise pollution would include people honking, car alarms, and people yelling. Live entertainment and alcohol consumption will also disrupt the peace and quiet of our neighborhood. Our residents should not have to cope with the consistent noise and related problems caused by an entertainment venue. It is unclear what the hours of operation would be, but any activities that would go beyond 10PM would be bothersome.

4. Safety and Security Concerns- The sale and consumption of alcohol along with live entertainment increases the probability of trespassing, loitering, and other disturbances. This project would only increase the problems such as speeding, car noise and gang activity that our neighborhood has been dealing with for years.

5. Impact on Neighborhood and quality of Life- Our neighborhood is a family oriented, residential area. The introduction of this kind of facility would negatively affect the quality of life of our residents. Our residents and the pedestrians who frequent our area deserve to live in a peaceful, quiet and safe community. For these reasons, I do not believe that this project is appropriate for the Fremont Park area. I urge the Planning Hearing Officer to consider our concerns and deny the CUP and AUP applications.

Thank you for your consideration of this matter. I will be attending the meeting tomorrow and would welcome the opportunity to testify. Please confirm your receipt of these written comments.

Please feel free to contact me if you can provide me with any further information or if you have any questions for me.

Sincerely,
Mardy Graves

From: Henrik Mosesi
Sent: Wednesday, December 4, 2024 8:17 AM
To: Lamberg, Alan
Subject: PCUP-003300-2024 & PAUP-004144-2024

Mr. Lamberg,

I am unable to attend this morning's meeting; however, I am submitting this email to express my strong objection to the proposed project.

I reside at 501 Burchett St., Glendale, CA 91203, directly across from the proposed banquet hall site. This area is already a noisy and congested intersection, with significant activity generated by Starbucks and Jack in the Box. Residents suffer from ongoing issues, including loitering by groups of men who gather to smoke and linger throughout the day and late into the night, sometimes past midnight. Additionally, vehicles frequently block my driveway as drivers rush to visit Starbucks, disregarding the residents who live here. These actions effectively turn Burchett Street into a parking lot for Starbucks, with little consideration for the neighborhood's character or its residents.

The proposed banquet hall will exacerbate the existing issues in this area and create additional nuisances for the residents for the following reasons:

1. Traffic Hazards:

The intersection near Burchett Street is already heavily impacted by traffic from Starbucks and Jack in the Box. The street is narrow and ill-equipped to handle increased vehicle flow. Additional traffic generated by a banquet hall will create further noise, congestion, and potential safety hazards, significantly impacting the quality of life for nearby residents.

2. Insufficient Parking:

The proposed project does not provide adequate parking spaces to accommodate its patrons. This will force attendees to park on residential streets, often late at night, disturbing residents and leading to potential conflicts between residents and visitors. Such a scenario will likely create hostility and ongoing friction in the neighborhood.

3. Noise Pollution:

The proposed banquet hall will generate additional noise, particularly from late-night events. The inclusion of a mezzanine intended for smoking and drinking further underscores the potential for disruption, as such activities are likely to occur during late hours. This represents a blatant disregard for the peace and welfare of residents in the vicinity.

4. Crime and Safety Concerns:

The introduction of another banquet hall, particularly one serving alcohol, raises significant safety concerns. Banquet halls in Glendale have been associated with increased criminal activity, including incidents involving violence. Bringing such a venue into a residential area places residents at unnecessary risk.

I urge you to carefully consider these objections, as well as those raised by other residents in the neighborhood. Approving this project would cause undue harm to the health, safety, and well-being of the residents, as well as negatively impact their ability to enjoy their homes and neighborhood. For these reasons, I respectfully request that this proposal be denied.

Sincerely,

--

Henrik M. Mosesi, Esq.
LAW OFFICE OF HENRIK MOSESI
1540 W. Glenoaks Blvd., Suite 206, Glendale, CA 91201

From: Jennifer Fieda
Sent: Wednesday, December 4, 2024 5:48 AM
To: Lamberg, Alan
Subject: 707 N Pacific Ave Banquet Hall

Good morning, Alan.

I live in the neighborhood of the old Rite Aid building that is being petitioned to be a banquet hall. Many of us have concerns over what a banquet hall is going to do to the traffic and parking on the streets that are already hard to find parking on. Most of the people in the area have been voicing their displeasure on our neighborhood app at having another banquet hall in the city especially one that is surrounded by homes.

1. If they have an exception to have so few off street parking spaces where are all the people attending events going to park?
2. If approved can all the street parking be residential permitted parking only?
3. Are there going to be modified hours so that residents don't have people being noisy leaving a party during the early morning hours?
4. How is the neighborhood going to be able to accommodate the traffic and parking between having this banquet hall and the new park that will have more people at since it will now have a soccer field, and a community room added to it? The traffic on Pacific between Doran and Glenoaks is already terrible. From lunch until at least 7pm there is a lot of traffic that backs up pretty bad.

This site is not a good location for this type of business. We would be so much better off with a restaurant, a grocery store or another store that is like a Rite Aid. Something that would benefit the people that live in the area.

Thank you for listening to everyone's concerns. I hope the city takes them into consideration before the project is fully approved.

Sincerely, Jennifer Fieda

Comments received after closing of the public hearing and before decision

From: Lawrence Israelson
Sent: Monday, December 9, 2024 3:15 PM
To: Lamberg, Alan
Subject: proposed CUP for 707 N. Pacific Ave.

Dear Mr. Lamberg:

I am a semi-regular customer of the Starbucks Coffee at Pacific and Burchett, and parking in that vicinity has been notoriously difficult since the first shot of espresso was pulled. I believe

allowing a banquet hall (with significant parking concessions!) to operate on the other side of Burchett is a monumentally bad idea.

I realize the banquet hall won't be operating 24/7, but I can certainly foresee nightmarish conditions whenever the hall is hosting an event, especially with only 15 percent of the recommended off-street parking spaces for a business of this scope.

Also, banquet hall gatherings typically have defined start and stop times, which will lead to heavy traffic congestion around those times. With multiple stoplights on a short stretch of Pacific (Glenoaks, Arden and Burchett, plus the on/off-ramps on each side of the 134 Freeway), the potential for gridlock is enormous.

Furthermore, the "back way" to the site (from Kenilworth) involves a narrow stretch of Burchett that absolutely cannot accommodate two-way traffic when cars are parked on both sides of the street. Finally, the existing parking lot can only be accessed from Burchett, with little hope of creating additional ingress points because of the freeway on the opposite side.

Thank you for your consideration in this matter,
Lawrence "Larry " Israelson
245 W. Loraine St., Apt. 334, Glendale CA 91202

From: SAM MANOUKIAN

Sent: Tuesday, December 10, 2024 3:46 PM

To: Lamberg, Alan

Cc: Golanian, Roubik Calvert, Bradley

Subject: Re: response to S. Manoukian RE: 707 N. Pacific Ave

Hi Alan,

Thank you for your quick response. Please Note that I am not the owner of the 516 Burchett Street office building, I am the Asset Manager, and my company handles the property management. Furthermore, I want to make it very clear that I am not opposed to the project and wish them nothing but success.

When the banquet hall operator approached us about leasing our parking lot, I presented that request to the building owner, and the owners responded with, "UNDER NO CIRCUMSTANCES WILL WE CONSIDER LEASING OUT ANY PORTION OF THE PARKING LOT."

The building owners have gone to great lengths and costs to secure the building and parking structure to protect the Tenant, a Title and Escrow company. Without getting into the operational details, our building houses the HQ / Clearing House for nine other title company locations in Southern California. As a result, millions of dollars of real estate transactions are processed and cleared for title and escrow companies. That is why extensive investment has taken place to secure the parking lot and the building. Every single car and person entering the building is

recorded, identified, and logged. That is also the reason why our parking lot and building are completely closed with security access fobs. Furthermore, they have activities and work that take place seven days a week, sometimes until 11:00 p.m. This is not a typical office building that stops working at 5:00 p.m. and only works M-F.

Please keep our building operation information confidential. Unfortunately, access to our parking lot or building at 516 Burchett Street is not an option.

Please let me know if you have any questions, and I wish the applicant success on the new project.

From: SAM MANOUKIAN

Sent: Monday, December 9, 2024 8:37 PM

To: Lamberg, Alan

Cc: Golanian, Roubik Calvert, Bradley

Subject: 707 N. Pacific Ave. - PCUP-003300-2024 Notification Regarding CUP Public Hearing

Hi Alan,

I was under the impression that whenever a public hearing is held for a CUP, all property owners within 500 feet of the subject property are notified. However, I recently learned that a CUP public hearing was held on November 18, 2024, and we did not receive any notification.

Our building is directly adjacent to the subject property, and we are the only property sharing a boundary with it. It's hard to believe that the property most affected by this decision wasn't notified, especially considering that the hearing concerned the potential development of a Banquet Hall next door.

We have invested over \$10 million in our property and secured one of the most prominent Title Companies in Southern California as our tenant. They relocated their headquarters to our building, and now I'm in the position of explaining the possible impacts of a Banquet Hall next door.

Could you please confirm whether the information I received is accurate? Knowing this will help me determine the next steps.

Thank you in advance for your assistance.

Sam S. Manoukian, CCIM

CEO

DPI-DIVERSIFIED PROPERTY INVESTMENTS

516 Burchett St.,

DRE: 00961674