

## Harvet, Michele M.

---

**From:** Tom Fletcher <tfletcher@aexcom.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, March 21, 2016 11:33 PM  
**To:** Harvet, Michele M.  
**Cc:** Jana Metge; Douglas Van Winkle  
**Subject:** Joe's Garage Public Hearing

Michele:

Our company LL LLC is the property owner of 1605 Hennepin, 1609 Hennepin, and 15 Maple Street, which are directly across the alley from the proposed patio for Joe's Garage and likely one of the two property owners that would be most affected by it. I just received an emailed notice of public hearing from Jana Metge at Citizens for Loring Park Community late this afternoon. Do you know what address the notice for LL LLC was sent to? It should have been sent to our 4445 West 77<sup>th</sup> Street Suite 102 address below.

Unfortunately less than 24 hours' notice does not give me enough time to discuss their proposal ahead of time with my neighbors at Joe's given the current late hour and my need to attend a funeral tomorrow morning. That being said we are currently in the review process at the State of Minnesota Historical Preservation office for our planned 12 unit apartment rehabilitation at 1605 Hennepin. While I do not believe it is the applicant's intention to have jukebox, karaoke, etc. on the patio, I would think that reasonable conditions could be attached to the license limiting radio, television, prerecorded music, jukebox, and karaoke on the patio. My observation is that loud background music increases the loudness of conversations as patrons try to converse over the music. Once again I doubt that the applicant is planning to provide music on the patio so I suspect that limiting music in this area will not interfere with their plans.

In the for what it is worth department I would note that parking is becoming tighter and tighter in the area of our block with the general intensification of its use. Does the City consider these factors in its licensing process? Joe's has valets for their front entrance and rents parking from our company and the Community College for their valet service. However, the proposed patio appears to be for more informal service that will probably not lend itself to a valet operation with customers ordering at an outside window. Many of the patio's customers will presumably need to park somewhere while they wait for and eat their orders. There could also be an increase in the frequent congestion of the alley area. Given the proximity of the patio to our parking across the alley can Joe's be directed to discourage their customers from waiting with their cars in the alley or parking without permission in private parking spaces on the block if either of these items becomes an issue? Possible options would be signage or having staff advise customers regarding the limits of the area if alley congestion or improper parking do in fact become issues. I would not propose that these measures be implemented unless congestion or parking problems actually occur.

To summarize my observation is that 4 Bells has been operated very responsibly and I do support their licensing request, which will add life to the alley and block. I do feel that it would make sense to include reasonable conditions to protect the long term interests of other neighboring properties.

I did copy Doug Van Winkle from Joe's on this email.

Thank you,

Tom Fletcher  
Chief Manager  
LL LLC  
President  
AEX Communications, Inc.