

Item 7.

From: Steve Eure <steveeure@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, October 6, 2019 6:52 PM
To: Brown, Jonathan W. - PDR
Subject: 214 Lombardy / 1601 Hanover - SUP

CAUTION: This message is from an external sender - Do not open attachments or click links unless you recognize the sender's address and know the content is safe.

As a neighbor to this building, I strongly object the issuance of the SUP for the following reasons:

1. increased density in the most dense neighborhood in Richmond is illogical,
2. the existing non-functioning trash removal situation would become a non-functioning commercial trash situation and thus a health hazard,
3. with the lose of 5 parking spaces, parking on Lombardy and Hanover would change from problematic to intolerable for all nearby residences every day of the year and
4. with an alcohol license and outdoor seating, well you got to be kidding....

Steve Eure
1702 Park Avenue



Virus-free. www.avast.com

From: katherine.laybourn@gmail.com
Sent: Sunday, October 6, 2019 8:36 PM
To: Brown, Jonathan W. - PDR
Cc: Bieber, Craig K. - City Council Office
Subject: 1601 Hanover Ave

CAUTION: This message is from an external sender - Do not open attachments or click links unless you recognize the sender's address and know the content is safe.

I am a neighbor residing near this address and am familiar with the ongoing issues regarding this property and concerns that the neighborhood have on how the new owners want to use 1601 Hanover and the attached property facing Lombardy.

From the newest set of documents which will be presented to the Richmond planning department tomorrow, I have the following concerns:

1. It appears that the owners overstated support from the FDA board by claiming the FDA supports their newest use permit when in fact, the FDA supported their previous request and are not aware of the recent changes.
2. As a resident living in a mixed use neighborhood, I support local businesses, but in this case I am not sure how our neighborhood would actually benefit from another restaurant/bar within a two block area.
3. The design plans were found NOT to be certified by an architect which I believe is required.
4. The plans call for a building permit use for up to 80 people in less than 1500 square feet of space. There are several safety concerns that need to be addresses regarding emergency egress.
5. The owners are requesting to add a third apartment to 1601 Hanover Ave. This will require emergency exits. Where are those plans?
6. Second to safety in a densely populated area, is the subject of sanitation. I don't think the owners have thought this through. Adding eight or more super cans to an already crowded alley is not the answer.

I STRONGLY OPPOSE THIS ORDNANCE AS IT IS CURRENTLY WRITTEN.

It is my recommendation that the planning committee defer any approval for this property until a reasonable solution can be made to accommodate the concerns of the neighborhood.

Sincerely,

Katherine (Laybourn) Baird
1704 Hanover Ave

From: Millie Green <milliesalazargreen@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, October 7, 2019 9:17 AM
To: Brown, Jonathan W. - PDR
Subject: 1601 Hanover Avenue and 214 N Lombardy

CAUTION: This message is from an external sender - Do not open attachments or click links unless you recognize the sender's address and know the content is safe.

Good morning,

My name is Millie Green and I live at 1601 Hanover. I have read the proposal by the owners of 1601 Hanover, and I am totally opposed to their plans. Following are some of my concerns:

Owner did not address any positive impact to the neighborhood.

There is no plan for an egress of the building - just imagine a fire situation in that small space.

There is no specific dedicated place to put trash cans - the alley is too narrow now and with six extra trash cans the trash truck would not be able to access it.

Outdoor seating - Lombardy is a very busy street with lots of traffic. There are trees planted on the sidewalk. Once you take a few feet for outside seating, which according to code needs to be covered, there will not little if any space for pedestrians. The possibility of a pedestrian being hit by a car increases dramatically. Keep in mind that this is a walking neighborhood with many children walking to and from school.

Parking - we have a very serious parking problem in the neighborhood. We already have two restaurants within a block and a half of each other with no designated parking. Imagine what 40-50 cars will do for parking to the legal TAX PAYING residents of the neighborhood.

As for the conversion of 1601 into three units, I just want to refresh the minds of those who may not remember. I sold real estate for 20 years and the rule has always been you can convert "more" to "less" but never less to more. Residents with large houses may just decide to convert to a duplex or a triplex for extra income. What would be the reason to stop them when special permission has been given to others?

There are many more reasons why this proposal is not valid and not congruent with the neighbors. This is not a personal vendetta but a practical one. We have a residential block and we don't need more problems.

Your consideration to these few points will be greatly appreciated.

Millie S Green
1609 Hanover Ave
804-218-4184

Sent from my iPhone

From: Edward Swibold / private <eswibold@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, October 6, 2019 9:09 PM
To: Brown, Jonathan W. - PDR
Cc: Bieber, Craig K. - City Council Office
Subject: 1601 Hanover Avenue

CAUTION: This message is from an external sender - Do not open attachments or click links unless you recognize the sender's address and know the content is safe.

As Tax Payers in the City of Richmond we object to the proposed changes to the property located at 1601 Hanover Avenue. The application documents put forward by the property owner appear to be purposefully vague, allowing for tremendous latitude with regard to what the actual business is: restaurant, bar, coffee shop, residence etc.. which conflicts with the various regulations and requirements as put forth by the City.

- What is the specific use of the property?
 - Is it a bar serving only beer and wine with a capacity for 80+ patrons that closes at 9PM with no parking?
 - a 22 seat restaurant ?
 - is it an ice-cream shop with street side service window?
- The property does not have enough room on site for the number of Super Cans necessary without blocking the emergency egress from the proposed 3rd residential unit or blocking emergency equipment from entering the ally.
- There are explicit prohibitions on exterior dining areas, which this property doesn't pass

The disingenuous nature of this particular application appears to be a fishing expedition on the part of the applicant. This application is essentially a list of potential business plan starting points. The big question being asked by the owner of 1601 Hanover is how many variances can I get from the City of Richmond and how far can I push the neighborhood and the Fan District? Nearly every aspect of their application requires an exception, exemption or variance with regard to public safety, zoning and the culture of the neighborhood. Basing a business plan on "What can I get away with?", seems like a repeat of the many previous failed iterations at 1601 Hanover Avenue.

How many failed restaurants, bars, coffee houses, ice cream shops need to cycle through that address before its understood that it's a lousy address for a restaurant / bar / etc. but makes for a fine residence.

Two Dissenting Tax Payers at 1612 Hanover Avenue

Edward Swibold

Susan Vial

From: Walter Murphy <wkmurphy2@aol.com>
Sent: Monday, October 7, 2019 9:27 AM
To: Brown, Jonathan W. - PDR
Subject: Fwd: 1601 Hanover Ave

CAUTION: This message is from an external sender - Do not open attachments or click links unless you recognize the sender's address and know the content is safe.

Dear Mr. Brown -

I am forwarding to you a letter I sent to Craig Bieber outlining our most pressing concerns for the proposed SUP for 1601 Hanover Ave that is on the docket today. I had not reached out earlier because I had planned to attend but cannot because of an unexpected conflict at work. We oppose the SUP as proposed and would appreciate your sharing ours concerns with the appropriate people.

Thank you,
Walter and Mary Stewart Murphy

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Walter Murphy <wkmurphy2@aol.com>
Date: October 7, 2019 at 9:17:39 AM EDT
To: Craig.Bieber@richmondgov.com
Subject: 1601 Hanover Ave

Dear Mr Bieber - My husband and I live at 1617 Hanover Ave. I was planning to attend the meeting concerning the SUP at 1601 Hanover Ave but because of a conflict at work I cannot so I am writing to express our concerns about the proposal.

First the FDA did not object to a proposal but that is not the same proposal that is being considered today and no one in the surrounding area was contacted to give input in the project to the FDA despite the concerns raised by neighboring property owners whose concerns expressed to the owners at an earlier meeting have yet to be addressed.

The proposal now calls for beer and wine to be served and a capacity of 80 people.

Trash for the restaurant is to be stored in the enclosed courtyard but what about their tenants' trash? The alley is narrow behind that property and trash storage

there may prevent trash, utility, and emergency vehicles from being able to get through.

No where does the proposal discuss how to safely evacuate residents and patrons in the event of a fire.

These two blocks of Lombardy already have a convenience store and two restaurants all of which have no designated parking on a busy thoroughfare that is already restricted to parking on one side to accommodate the volume of traffic. Lack of parking is already very much an issue as indicated by the recent parking study and the parking habits of residents and visitors, especially on weekends, where cars are parked in crosswalks and too close to fire hydrants because there is more demand than safe parking permits. The safety hazards of adding to an already overburdened system in a high traffic area have still not been addressed by the owners.

Finally, the language of the ordinance is much more expansive than the proposal for the use of the property and strips the neighborhood of the limited avenues it has to enforce whatever may ultimately be approved. The owners initially indicated there would be no alcohol sold but have now proposed beer and wine sales with a seating capacity and design that more resembles a bar than it does a coffee shop or ice cream parlor that the owners have suggested will be the use of the space. The ordinance must be rewritten to reflect what the board actually intends and not give the owners the ability to develop the property virtually unchecked.

I do not want our inability to attend the meeting to be interpreted as indifference to the proposal.

Thank you for sharing our concerns with the appropriate people.

Walter and Mary Stewart Murphy
1617 Hanover Ave

Sent from my iPhone

From: william thrower <whthrower@msn.com>
Sent: Sunday, October 6, 2019 8:45 PM
To: Bieber, Craig K. - City Council Office; Brown, Jonathan W. - PDR
Subject: Ord No. 2019-259 special use permit amendment for 214 N Lombardy St

CAUTION: This message is from an external sender - Do not open attachments or click links unless you recognize the sender's address and know the content is safe.

I live at 1525 Hanover Ave, the corner of Hanover and Lombardy, directly across from the subject property. This property is limited in size, and the owners are attempting to get far more utility than the property can provide. On a street with parking only on one side, they offer nothing to the neighborhood but noise, clutter, trash and garbage, all detrimental considerations. Best use for 214 N Lombardy would be off-street parking for the units at 1601 Hanover.

Mention has been made of 5 parking passes available for residential units at 1601 Hanover Ave, which is in Parking Zone 2. The passes should be for Zone 2, and not Zone 1.

The process of presenting plans for use seems to have moved from the original plan presented to the neighbors for a "coffee shop" to something including beer and wine. This is not acceptable to us and seems to portend the previous manifestation which was so unacceptable.

Thank you for your consideration.

From: Jim Green <jimgreen1945@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, October 7, 2019 9:58 AM
To: Brown, Jonathan W. - PDR; craig.beiber@richmondgov.com
Cc: BDBurks@verizon.net; milliesalazargreen@gmail.com
Subject: Proposed special use permit for 214 North Lombardy Street

CAUTION: This message is from an external sender - Do not open attachments or click links unless you recognize the sender's address and know the content is safe.

Gentlemen:

I am concerned with the proposed special use permit being considered for the subject property. To me it seems as though the planned use outlined in proposed ordinance No. 2019-259 does not reflect the neighborhood and is not beneficial for those living nearby. The plan does not address several concerns that I have about the proposed use. Parking in the Fan is always a problem and the introduction of three additional rental units will add to that. Two units with off street parking would be better. The introduction of a restaurant with 80 customers potentially, not to mention staff, will be a nightmare. The last time there was a restaurant on site the workers parked in the narrow alley behind the unit. Can you imagine delivery trucks blocking the alleys and Lombardy ? This would be a critical safety issue with traffic and service vehicles.

Another problem I see is trash and refuse management. Already the back of the property is a site where the adjacent tenants from 1603 Hanover dump debris with little concern for the neighborhood. Many times I have had to collect the trash and put it in the super cans. We have sent photos of this mess to Council Person Gray from time to time. I can only imagine what will happen with the addition of more trash. The idea of the restaurant having its trash service being totally within the property sounds good, however reality is that this is not realistic and that a certain amount of the debris will end up in the alley. When that happens the City will do nothing to correct the issue.

Safety is another big issue I see with the increased traffic, both vehicular and foot. The proposed plan does little to address this. I anticipate that if this special use is approved the owner will see this as a message that he can take liberty to incorporate changes as time goes by to extend business hours, serve other types of alcohol, play loud music, etc. Given his record of not properly permitting the work that he has already done, I expect that he will have no problem doing whatever he wants after he gets a foothold into the neighborhood.

I hope that you will support denial of this request as written and require a proposal that is in line with the neighborhood.

I appreciate your attention to this matter.

Jim Green
1609 Hanover Ave
Richmond, Virginia 23220

Mobile: 804-901-1299

From: Emily Thrower <evthrower@hotmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, October 6, 2019 9:39 PM
To: Brown, Jonathan W. - PDR; Bieber, Craig K. - City Council Office
Subject: SUP application for 214 N. Lombardy and 1601 Hanover

CAUTION: This message is from an external sender - Do not open attachments or click links unless you recognize the sender's address and know the content is safe.

Dear Mr Brown and Mr. Bieber,

I'm writing to you about the SUP application for the above mentioned property that will be considered by the Planning Commission tomorrow. At the beginning, I'd like to address the statement that the FDA has voted not to oppose this application. The application they voted not to oppose - not support - is not the same one that will be before the Planning Commission.

In fact, from the looks of the schematic that accompanies the application, it appears that the property doesn't come close to meeting the requirements for the SUP. The entire lot is filled with building, right up to the alley. This building is basically the depth of my garage directly across the street. The SUP proposes storing supercans in the path of the required emergency exit for the three apartments. Does the Fire Chief object? There are questions and requirements that an architect might have addressed if one had been consulted.

The SUP asks for sidewalk seating on Lombardy. That would allow beer and wine to be served outside once an ABC license is obtained. This is not allowed anywhere else on Lombardy for good reason - there is not enough room and this is essentially a residential street. All other restaurants on Lombardy have recognized this. Once again, a space that was once a small neighborhood market and then a small fine dining restaurant is simply not large enough to be a successful restaurant in today's market. I am strongly opposed to any seating on Lombardy Street for the noise and the congestion it will bring.

We have lived in our home for 34 years and have experienced a variety of businesses at 214 North Lombardy. Our home at 1525 Hanover Avenue is parallel to this property and we will suffer the full brunt of whatever is granted in the SUP. The owner is asking to allow acoustic music in what looks like a bar, upstairs and down, for 80 people. And he asks that the tenant be allowed to apply for an ABC license to serve beer and wine. And the SUP says the business is to close at 9:00 p.m. Is there another restaurant in the Fan that closes at 9:00 p.m.? Do we really think one at this location will if it has paying customers drinking at 9:00 p.m.? Who will enforce these restrictions? Poor Boys across the street is required to close at 11:00 p.m. but routinely stays open until 2:00 a.m. There is never enforcement on violations that Fan residents object to. We are always recognized as complaining neighbors when we object to SUP violations. These violations often lead to patron behavior that is beyond the control of restaurant owners, but we suffer the consequences regardless.

Ultimately, this property is not equipped to deliver what is being asked of it. The spaces are small and inadequate for public health and safety for the capacity planned. Waiving requirements that physically cannot be met is not good policy. I request that the Planning Commission not grant the SUP.

Sincerely,

Emily Thrower
1525 Hanover Avenue
359-0804