00001						
1	CITY OF MILWAUKEE					
2	COMMON COUNCIL					
3						
4	In the Matter of:					
5						
6	PHOENIX BAR AND GRILL					
7	6222 West Fond du Lac Avenue					
8						
9	Proceedings held in the above-entitled					
10	matter, commencing at 9:30 a.m., December 13th, 2005,					
11	in the Common Council Chambers, 200 East Wells Street,					
12	Milwaukee, Wisconsin, before the Common Council,					
13	reported by Terese M. Schiebenes of Milwaukee					
14	Reporters Associated, Inc.					
15	A-P-P-E-A-R-A-N-C-E-S					
16	MICHAEL WHITCOMB, Attorney-at-Law,					
	663 West Wisconsin Avenue Milwaukee, Wisconsin, 53203,					
17	appeared on behalf of the Applicant.					
18	OFFICE OF THE CITY ATTORNEY, BY BRUCE					
	SCHRIMPF, 200 East Wells Street Milwaukee,					
19	Wisconsin, 53202, appeared on behalf of the Common					
	Council.					
20						

2.4

PROCEEDINGS

THE CLERK: Recommendation of nonrenewal of the Class B Tavern and Tavern Amusement License of Andrea Chavis, agent for Diamond Food and Beverages, Incorporated, for the premises at 6222 West Fond du Lac Avenue, known as the Phoenix Bar and Grill in the 2nd Aldermanic District. On this item, written exceptions were filed.

(Other proceedings.)

THE CLERK: Counsel and applicant, Andrea Chavis, are present.

PRESIDENT HINES: With Ms. Chavis being present, Alderman Jim Bohl moves to go into the committee of the whole to hear oral argument on behalf of the licensee in opposition to the report and recommendations and the statement presented by the City Attorney. Is there any objection? Hearing and seeing no objections, we are not in the committee of the whole.

Each side shall be limited to five minutes, and the arguments shall be limited to the subject matter of the report and recommendations and the written exceptions. With that being the case, we will hear from the representative of Andrea Chavis. Why don't you come to the podium, identify yourself.

2.4

MR. WHITCOMB: Thank you, Mr. President, members of the Common Council. My name is Michael Whitcomb, I'm the attorney for the renewal licensee for the Phoenix Bar and Grill at 6222 West Fond du Lac Avenue.

Initially I'd like to represent to the Council that my client appeared before the Utilities & Licenses Committee without counsel, having only seen the notice for the hearing that particular morning. Therefore, her case was not as well presented as it could have been, with fuller explanations regarding the objections of the police department that were presented before the committee.

At the outset, it is respectfully submitted that the nonrenewal of all the licenses for this establishment is far too draconian for the objections and the testimony that appeared before the committee. There were no neighborhood objections to the renewal of the licenses, and the foundation for the nonrenewal recommendation was strictly from the content of the police report.

Four incidents in that report had not previously been considered by the Utilities & License Committee. For the renewal year of 2004, there was no hearing, there were no objections, the license was

2.4

automatically renewed. However, there was an incident in 2004, and that was an over-capacity incident, for which a citation was issued and a fine paid.

During the last license year, the police report showed three incidents. One, respectfully submit, cannot be considered since it was a sale to minor, it did not occur within 12 months of a similar violation, therefore, according to State Statute, it cannot be considered on renewal of the license.

The second incident was innocuous at best, is failure to post the capacity for the establishment, and what had transpired was that the framed capacity placard fell from the wall, slid down the wall behind the bar. That was posted immediately thereafter, a fine was paid.

The third incident reported in the last license year which caused the committee the greatest concern was an armed robbery, which occurred off the premise. It was in the neighborhood of the premise, but it did not occur on the premise. The only tie-in with the licensed establishment, based upon a police report, was that the victim of the armed robbery indicated that he had been in the licensed premise earlier that evening. However, there's nothing to indicate that the perpetrator of the crime was in the

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

establishment, any conduct within the establishment caused the incident to occur outside the premises, and in fact, the licensee, Ms. Chavis, was at the premise at the time the incident occurred and was unaware that it had occurred that evening, for she was not even contacted until the following day concerning the incident, at which time she indicated to the authorities that she was unfamiliar with any aspect of the incident and did not know whether or not, in fact, the victim of the armed robbery had indeed been in the premises prior to that time.

It is respectfully submitted that these incidents do not justify nonrenewal of these licenses. This establishment has been in existence from 1997, a substantial investment was made in the licensed premise in constructing a kitchen, a restaurant, and a tavern, and the licensed premise has had a good run since 1997, but for an earlier incident which occurred for which a 60-day suspension was imposed, and that incident occurred where the entire family of the owners was in Atlanta for a wedding of their child, they had rented the premise out to a private party, who engaged in activity which was clearly contrary to the ordinances of the City of Milwaukee.

Admittedly, the incidents did occur, a

25

2.4

suspension was imposed, and it was proper. However, it was not attributable to any contact or disregard of the law by the licensee, as the licensee was at a family wedding in Atlanta that particular weekend.

The local alderman, the new alderman from the district, from my client's perspective, is justifiably concerned about the development of Fond du Lac Avenue at that particular location, is justifiably concerned about the neighborhood concerns of that area. However, this hotel is an asset to the neighborhood. It was cleaned up by the proprietor. It is now a valid hotel, not a flea bag as it once was, and the bar and restaurant was an adjunct and an attraction and also a benefit to the patrons of the hotel.

To address the concerns of the local alderman, paying much attention to the development of Fond du Lac Avenue, my client has authorized me to indicate to the Council that it is willing to withdraw its cabaret license application renewal, that the concerns, sporadic as they have been since 1997 concerning patrons at the establishment, it's more geared towards youthful patrons than patrons of the hotel using the bar and restaurant as they stay at the hotel. It was the cabaret license and the live

2.4

entertainment that attracted people other than hotel patrons, and they're willing at this time to withdraw the renewal application for the cabaret license and instead request that a tavern dance license be provided, which would allow them to have live music, and for those hotel patrons and neighbors that wish to dance to the music, they may, but they will no longer have any live entertainment, which admittedly at times did create concerns at the establishment, not many of which were brought to the attention of the authorities, but it is not worth the investment of time and energy from managing the establishment under the cabaret because it does not provide a comparable benefit to the patrons at the hotel.

PRESIDENT HINES: One minute, please.

MR. WHITCOMB: Thank you, Mr. President. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted to this honorable Council, notwithstanding the recommendation of the Utilities & Licenses Committee, recommend the

renewal of the Class B Tavern License accept the withdrawal of the cabaret renewal application, and grant the request made at this time for the tavern dance license. And if that's not procedurally proper,

what my client will do thereafter is file a new

25 application for a tavern dance license, which will be

2.4

separately considered by the Utilities & Licenses Committee and this Council.

What's most important is to maintain the ability to sell alcoholic beverages at the establishment in conjunction with the hotel, especially over this holiday season, because my client has numerous parties booked at the hotel, and it is known as one of the few hotels minority-owned in the City of Milwaukee that does provide a benefit to minority patrons at the hotel and at the banquet facilities at the establishment.

Thank you, Mr. President, thank you, members of the Council. Respectfully request that this Council move to amend the recommendations of the committee, accept the withdrawal of the cabaret license, and vote to renew the Class B Tavern License. Thank you.

PRESIDENT HINES: Thank you, Attorney Whitcomb. Why don't you stay here, please. Are there some questions? The Chair recognizes Alderman Joe Davis.

ALDERMAN DAVIS: Thank you, Mr. Whitcomb. I appreciate your overview of the incident. A couple questions that I have for you. Are you referring to a police report that was submitted with the application

2.4

that was in summary when you stated that a certain incident that occurred on January 22nd, 2005 did not occur on the premises, the establishment, which is 6222 West Fond du Lac Avenue?

MR. WHITCOMB: I'm referring to the incident report that the Milwaukee Police Department prepared that was submitted together with the notice of the hearing before the Utilities & License Committee. Did I misspeak?

ALDERMAN DAVIS: Yes. Are you familiar with the entire police report that gives the entire instance as far as the interview of certain -- not only the victim but also a witness who witnessed it, who was actually involved in the incident that was at 6222 West Fond du Lac Avenue?

MR. WHITCOMB: No. My client was not prepared notice of that particular report and did not address it, as she was unaware of it and was unaware of the facts of the particular incident.

ALDERMAN DAVIS: I want to bring to your attention that there is an entire police report that the police department interviewed witnesses that does place the incident on the premises of 6222 West Fond du Lac Avenue, which is the Phoenix Bar and Grill and the Diamond Inn, and it specifically says, if I may

00010 1 read through --PRESIDENT HINES: No. Just questions. You'll get a chance to speak to that issue. MR. WHITCOMB: I would object to that, 4 5 Alderman, on the grounds of due process, since my 6 client did not receive notice of any statements 7 contained in that report and is not in a position to 8 respond to them either here or at the Utilities & 9 License Committee. The only notice we received 10 concerning that incident was contained in the Incident 11 Report by the Milwaukee Police Department, which was 12 submitted along with a notice for the hearing. 13 ALDERMAN DAVIS: And it is clear -- Well, 14 let me ask you this. Does your client understand that 15 there are not supposed to be any rap music or hip-hop 16 music at that establishment, based upon the 17 application in which they submitted to the Utilities & 18 Licensing Division of the City of Milwaukee? 19 MR. WHITCOMB: It's my understanding that 20 the application submitted for the cabaret license, 21 which is licensed for the playing of live music, 22 indicated that the live music would not be rap music. 23 It's also my understanding that on the night of the 2.4 incident that there was rap performances made by 25 patrons of the establishment, but it was not rap music

2.4

performed by live entertainers which was authorized by the cabaret license.

The submission of the cabaret license restricting the type of music, as I understand it, restricts the type of music by live performers. Or on the night of the incident, the rap was not by live performers hired by the establishment but by patrons doing rap music along with, as I understand it, the juke box.

ALDERMAN DAVIS: Are you aware that your client admitted that there was a private party held that night that had to do with G Mafia Records?

MR. WHITCOMB: I reviewed the tape of the hearing before the Utilities & License Committee, and that's not my recollection of the testimony of the client. My recollection was there were representatives of a music company in the establishment, but I did not understand that it was a private party. It was just a happenstance that they were there at the time, not that they had rented out any portion of the premises for a private party.

ALDERMAN DAVIS: As you review that testimony, are you aware that I brought to your client's attention and asked your client specifically was there any event held that night of the incident,

00012 1 and she indicated yes? MR. WHITCOMB: I'd have to re-review that. I don't have direct recollection of that at this time, 4 Alderman. 5 ALDERMAN DAVIS: Thank you, Mr. President. 6 PRESIDENT HINES: Are there any additional 7 questions of Attorney Whitcomb? Thank you. 8 MR. WHITCOMB: Merry Christmas to you all. 9 Thank you. 10 PRESIDENT HINES: We will now hear from the 11 City Attorney's Office. 12 MR. SCHRIMPF: Thank you, Mr. President, 13 members. Bruce Schrimpf from the City Attorney's 14 Office. 15 Mr. Whitcomb and I do not often agree, but 16 there are two points that I can agree with him on. 17 First of all, we have to confine ourselves to the 18 record that was made before the Utilities & Licenses 19 Committee, we cannot go off that record, we cannot 20 introduce other documents at this point. 21 The other thing I agree with him on is 22 regarding the underage sale of alcohol. It is 23 absolutely true you do need two within a year of the 24 first, and you need convictions on them in order to 25

consider them. The reason why they are in the

2.4

Findings of Fact is because that is one of the mechanisms by which we keep track of whether or not there's two in one year or two within a year from the date of the first.

Respecting the Findings of Fact and the police report, it is certainly true that this organization had a 60-day suspension at the 2003-2004 renewal. The 2004 renewal did not pose a major problem except that there was the over-capacity, and then, of course, there were the incidents that occurred in 2005, one of which was the armed robbery. The police indicated that this occurred as the individual was leaving the Phoenix Bar and Grill, he had been a patron at the Bar and Grill, and of course, he actually had been shot. Fortunately, he did not die, but he had been shot, and there was an attempt to take -- or I guess they actually did take his wallet out of his back pocket.

This continues a long, long history of problems at this location, which, again, the Council certainly can consider the entire history of the organization. The mere fact that there was a 60-day suspension two years ago does not really inure to the benefit of this particular licensee. However, whether or not you impose a suspension and the length of that

2.4

suspension is, again, repose to your sound discretion, keeping in mind that there has been a 60-day suspension imposed at this point. The minimum suspension is 10 days, the maximum suspension is 90 days.

With respect to the request to withdraw the cabaret license, I quickly checked 90-35-11 of the Code of Ordinances, and that particular piece of this has to go back to the Utilities & Licenses Committee for consideration. Beyond that, I'll be happy to answer any questions that you may have.

PRESIDENT HINES: Thank you, Attorney Schrimpf. Are there any questions of Attorney Schrimpf?

MR. SCHRIMPF: Thank you.

PRESIDENT HINES: There being no additional persons here to contest, the Chair recognizes Alderman Willie Wade. Let me first go into committee of the whole. I apologize. Alderman Witkowiak moves that the committee now rises. Are there any motions relative to the following matters? The chair recognizes Alderman Willie Wade.

ALDERMAN WADE: Thank you, Mr. President. Not being present at the beginning of this hearing, I want to make sure that it is reported that I did read

00015						
1	it, so I'm able to vote in this segment.					
2	PRESIDENT HINES: You were not available					
3	We marked you as excused during that session, and not					
4	being part of any part of it negates you the					
5	opportunity to vote or taking action.					
6	ALDERMAN WADE: Thank you.					
7	PRESIDENT HINES: Are there any other					
8	motions relative to the following matters? That being					
9	the case, there is no further discussion, I request a					
10	vote of those members present to approve the					
11	recommendations of the Licenses Committee as contained					
12	in File No. 050811. Will the City Clerk please call					
13	the roll.					
14	THE CLERK: Alderman Hamilton.					
15	ALDERMAN HAMILTON: Aye.					
16	THE CLERK: Alderman Davis.					
17	ALDERMAN DAVIS: Aye.					
18	THE CLERK: Alderman D'Amato.					
19	ALDERMAN D'AMATO: Aye.					
20	THE CLERK: Alderman Bauman.					
21	ALDERMAN BAUMAN: Aye.					
22	THE CLERK: Alderman Bohl.					
23	ALDERMAN BOHL: No.					
24	THE CLERK: Alderman McGee.					
25	ALDERMAN McGEE: Aye.					

00016					
1	THE CLERK: Alderman Donovan.				
2	ALDERMAN DONOVAN: Aye.				
3	THE CLERK: Alderman Puente.				
4	ALDERMAN PUENTE: Aye.				
5	THE CLERK: Alderman Murphy.				
6	ALDERMAN MURPHY: Aye.				
7	THE CLERK: Alderman Dudzik.				
8	ALDERMAN DUDZIK: Aye.				
9	THE CLERK: Alderman Witkowski.				
10	ALDERMAN Witkowski: Aye.				
11	THE CLERK: Alderman Zielinski.				
12	ALDERMAN ZIELINSKI: Aye.				
13	THE CLERK: Mr. President.				
14	PRESIDENT HINES: Aye.				
15	THE CLERK: 12 ayes, 1 no, 2 excused.				
16	PRESIDENT HINES: 12 ayes, 1 no, 2 excused.				
17	The file is adopted.				
18	Alderman Bohl now moves for adoption of the				
19	recommendation of the Licenses Committee. Will				
20	the City Clerk please call the roll.				
21	THE CLERK: Alderman Hamilton.				
22	ALDERMAN HAMILTON: Aye.				
23	THE CLERK: Alderman Davis.				
24	ALDERMAN DAVIS: Aye.				
25	THE CLERK: Alderman D'Amato.				

00017					
1	ALDERMAN D'AMATO: Aye.				
2	THE CLERK: Alderman Bauman.				
3	ALDERMAN BAUMAN: Aye.				
4	THE CLERK: Alderman Bohl.				
5	ALDERMAN BOHL: Aye.				
6	THE CLERK: Alderman McGee.				
7	ALDERMAN McGEE: Aye.				
8	THE CLERK: Alderman Wade.				
9	ALDERMAN WADE: Aye.				
10	THE CLERK: Alderman Donovan.				
11	ALDERMAN DONOVAN: Aye.				
12	THE CLERK: Alderman Puente.				
13	ALDERMAN PUENTE: Aye.				
14	THE CLERK: Alderman Murphy.				
15	ALDERMAN MURPHY: Aye.				
16	THE CLERK: Alderman Dudzik.				
17	ALDERMAN DUDZIK: Aye.				
18	THE CLERK: Alderman Witkowski.				
19	ALDERMAN Witkowski: Aye.				
20	THE CLERK: Alderman Zielinski.				
21	ALDERMAN ZIELINSKI: Aye.				
22	THE CLERK: Mr. President.				
23	PRESIDENT HINES: Aye.				
24	THE CLERK 14 ayes, 1 excused.				
25	PRESIDENT HINES: 14 ayes, 1 excused. The				

```
00018
1 committee report is adopted.
2 (Proceedings concluded at 9:45 a.m.)
```

```
00019
1 STATE OF WISCONSIN )
   MILWAUKEE COUNTY )
4
5
                  I, TERESE M. SCHIEBENES, of Milwaukee
6
        Reporters Associated, Inc., 5120 West Blue Mound Road,
        Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53208, certify that the
7
        foregoing proceedings is a full and complete
8
9
        transcript of my stenographic notes taken in the
10
        foregoing proceedings.
11
12
13
14
15
16
                               TERESE M. SCHIEBENES
17
18
                               Certified Shorthand Reporter
19
20
21
   Dated this day of
                                       , 2005.
22
23
24
```