

From: [S.Mason](#)
To: [*CI-StPaul_LH-Licensing](#)
Cc: [Rebecca Noecker](#)
Subject: 2024-0001073 685 Grand Ave
Date: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 12:57:18 PM

To DSI Licensing and Inspections:

Good day. I am writing in reference to 2024-0001073, liquor licenses for 685 Grand Ave, Razava Bread Co. Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

I was one of several neighbors who attended the public hearing hosted by the Summit Hill Association earlier in the summer related to the liquor license and outdoor service for Razava Bread Co. At that meeting, neighbors expressed support for the new restaurant and bakery, but also expressed concern centered largely on the outdoor seating area. The bulk of the concerns centered on the outdoor service of food and alcohol at the late night hours requested in the application. There were also several questions and concerns expressed about the narrow 3 foot area being insufficient for patio service. From the plans presented at the meeting, there would be "two-top" outdoor tables in this narrow area between the sidewalk and the building. It seems impossible that service could be confined to such a small area. Unlike other Grand Avenue establishments that have applied and received sidewalk café permits (Iron Ranger, Hyacinth), this area has a grass boulevard (with sprinklers) instead of a paved boulevard, so there isn't space for pedestrians to walk or roll around if seating or patrons push out beyond the narrow three foot strip. The only access to these outdoor tables would be from the corner door. Where will servers stand? Two-top tables are shown, but what's to stop three or more patrons from standing together at a table, or dragging a chair or two around, blocking the sidewalk? Can/will some kind of barrier be required to prevent encroachment into the public right-of-way?

From the plans presented at the meeting, there would be outdoor tables in this narrow "patio" area on both Saint Albans, a residential side street, as well as on Grand Ave. To my knowledge there is not a single example on Grand in which there is late night bar seating in a "patio" setting on a residential side street. St Albans is a densely populated residential street with 50+ condos, with bedroom windows and porches in close proximity. And while Grand Avenue is a "busy" street, it is a mixed use corridor, with more residences than businesses. At this corner, there are 80+ apartments directly across the street on Grand, in addition to the 695 Grand apartments directly above the restaurant bakery. Hundreds of households would be negatively impacted by noise from late night (more accurately, early morning) patrons.

At the meeting, neighbors requested that the outdoor service have an earlier closing time than indoor service for the restaurant. It is important that the outdoor drinking and dining not violate the nighttime sound ordinance. An outdoor service closing time of 8:00 PM on weekdays is reasonable given the high number of housing units within close proximity. Area residents include families with young children, elderly residents, and of course working people who need to get up in the morning. On Fridays and Saturdays, 9:30 last call with a 10:00 outdoor close would be acceptable. But 12:30 AM is much too late for outdoor food and alcohol service in a residential neighborhood, especially in a location that is pushed up against the sidewalk with no space to serve as, or in which to construct, a sound buffer. To my knowledge, there is not a single patio bar service for any Grand Avenue business without space to provide screening and a sound buffer.

At the meeting, representatives of the restaurant stated that they do not plan on being open late, and will likely close in the afternoon or early evening. Then why apply for midnight closing with a 12:30 AM "vacate" time? We unfortunately have had more than one experience with businesses saying one thing at a meeting and then doing another thing afterward. Experience teaches that we should believe the hours on the application, not the words at the meeting. But if we do take the restaurant at their word, **incorporating an 8:00 PM "indoor only" time will not cause any hardship or any change to their business plans, and will ensure that hundreds of neighbors are not negatively impacted by noise late at night.**

It was our understanding that the Summit Hill Association was going to send a letter summarizing neighbors' concerns. Therefore, neighbors were quite surprised to learn that the license is proposed to be approved with a 12:30 AM "vacate" time (period), with no additional conditions related to the outdoor dining and liquor service.

Neighbors welcome the restaurant bakery and do not oppose the liquor license application, but **only provided that reasonable conditions are attached to the Liquor-Outdoor Service Area (Patio) license, namely:**

- 1. Physical Barrier to keep the tables, patrons, and alcohol on the "patio"/premises**
- 2. Last call at 7:30 PM for outdoor food and drink, with "patio" areas vacated by 8:00 PM Sunday through Thursday**
- 3. Last call at 9:30 PM for outdoor food and drink, with "patio" areas vacated by 10:00 PM Friday and Saturday**

Thank you for your time and attention to this matter. In closing, I wish to reiterate that myself and other neighbors welcome the restaurant and bakery. We simply ask for proactive measures from Licensing in the form of a few common sense rules to prevent nighttime noise violations, encroachment onto the sidewalk, and off-premises alcohol consumption.

Sincerely,
Sonja Mason
St Albans St S