

I am opposed to Bill 1047 in its current form and have strong concerns regarding a2. These lines are open to interpretation and need language clarifying their intention. I live next door to a grandfathered tavern that does not meet any of the requirements in the bill's a3 section. Over 10 months ago, we identified to the liquor board that this makes the tavern ineligible for dancing and live music licenses. The board responded by citing they have the ability to grandfather dancing licenses, even though there have not been any regulations, dating all the way back to at least 1980, that support this claim. The board has been dismissing complaints from our neighborhood by erroneously citing they have a grandfathering power they have not been granted. I am concerned that Bill 1047's a2, as it is written, will be subject to further loose interpretation by the board and they will continue to claim discretion as the reason they do not enforce their music permit regulations.

A different concern about a2: We met last week with the board and OPZ to discuss the tavern's unapproved expansions that brought the tavern's activity area even closer to our property line. These expansions conflict with liquor board regulations that require OPZ's involvement and zoning expertise. It was clear during our meeting that there is not an established procedure defining the way OPZ needs to support liquor board regulations. OPZ is in the habit of assessing zoning within the confines of their own enforcement policies, but this does not fulfill the obligations of the liquor board's code. In summary, in the absence of a strong working relationship between the two agencies, I believe Bill 1047 needs language that more clearly defines OPZ's role to meet the bill's objective.