

Varsh, Tess

From: Terence Nicholson [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, July 21, 2021 5:34 PM
To: Driver, Jennifer
Subject: Comments for Public Hearing MOD CUP #6740

CAUTION: This email was delivered from the Internet. Do not click links or open attachments unless you *know* the content is safe. Report phish using the Phish Alert Button. [Learn more...](#)

Dear Jennifer,

Herewith are my formal comments for the consideration of the Board of Zoning Appeals with regards to modification of CUP #6740.

My family and I are residents of the neighbourhood and are situated quite close to the location in question. I was in attendance when the modification to the CUP was disapproved by the hearing officer on April 7, and strongly agreed with his reasons for disapproving the modification.

I have thoroughly studied the Staff Report for the appeal and noted the recommendation to overturn the Hearing Officer's decision. Whilst I am pleased to see that the applicant has amended the days and time of operation for the banquet hall, I have to **disagree** with the Staff's approval of the project as the applicant has failed to address the other concerns that were raised by the Hearing Officer.

The banquet hall would still be detrimental to the health, safety and general well-being of the people residing in the neighborhood. Moving the valet service from on-site on Chester Ave, to "offsite" on Michigan Ave is simply moving the problem over to the next street. There will still be an increase in traffic and people (possibly under the influence of alcohol) which will be felt in the immediate neighborhood. As per the application, the venue can hold up to 200 patrons, most of which will be arriving by car. The 36 parking spaces is simply inadequate, and those cars will spill over onto the public streets of the surrounding neighborhood, taking up already scarce parking spaces for residents. The assumption that the applicant makes that "most guests will arrive in pairs, and that some guests will choose to come via rideshare" is an unrealistic one in this day and age, especially since the onset of the pandemic. Even with highly skilled and time-consuming stacking, that parking lot is simply too small. Who wants to wait 20 minutes whilst the valet has to retrieve their car stacked at the back??

I frequently walk past the location and have yet to see any evidence of an "adult day-care" going into operation. What I have seen is lots of furniture and work that can be associated with a banquet hall going into that building. This leads me to believe that the entire building is actually going to be utilized as a banquet hall, and that one of the reasons for the so-called "adult day-care" Mod CUP, and sharing of the space, was as a work-around to the shortage of parking spaces that would be needed for a banquet hall of that size. Should the project be approved, I would definitely suggest that one of the provisions in the 6-month review of the Conditional Use Permit, would be to review the operations and actual existence of the "adult day-care".

Yours truly,

Terry Nicholson