

Vernice Hankins

From: Rachel Kelley <rachelbernota@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 25, 2020 2:22 PM
To: Preferential Parking; councilmtgitems
Cc: kerry@riddleinc.com; tjclynch@mac.com; Anne Saldo; Candy Arnold; Casey Price; Charles Haynes; Dahli; David Barney; Denise Magilnick; George Bernota; Jane Dempsey; Jaspreet Kaur; Jennifer Lynch; Jill Elmore; Killeen C Pilon; Nate Taylor; Rachel Kelley; Rick Mori; Susan Alinsangan; Tim Tunks; Vincent Esparza; zinajosephs@aol.com; gwynne@gwynnepugh.com; linda.jassim@gmail.com; bp.doyle@mac.com; Jason Kligier; jojemi1@twc.com; Scott Johnson
Subject: Preferential Parking 2/25 agenda item #11

EXTERNAL

Dear City Council Member,

I live on 10th Street, a cul-de-sac south of Ashland Avenue, and east of Lincoln Blvd. within the preferential parking boundaries.

What is needed:

- **overnight permit only parking.**
- **2-hour limit daily permit parking** (petitioned signatures).
- **Exclude permits to unbundled parking developments** (2903 Lincoln+802/810 Ashland).
- **Low income subsidy for one pass per affordable unit.**

Ashland Ave has reached parking saturation:

- **multi-family housing street: 8 single-family, 96 multi-family homes (46 are affordable units).**
- **47 street spots, 104 housing units with .451 parking spots per unit.**
- **Ashland is a sub-standard width street (28' wide) with "blind" hills creating parking/driving hazards.**

Parking activity here is already intense:

- **Red zone parking is common.**
- **Driveways wholly or partially blocked.**
- **Construction parking.**
- **LAX short-term parking.**

Please prevent all residential, retail and employee parking from 2903 Lincoln. This means evening/night parking as well. Protect our dense neighborhood from parking hunting with driveway turnarounds and headlight intrusions. We do not share the Planning Commission's enthusiasm about 2903 Lincoln "activating" our quiet "9-5 with schoolchildren" lives.

Please reconsider the technical denial from July 2019.

Santa Monica residents deserve the same courtesy extended to developers -the option to wait until the next meeting when there are only four Council Members voting.

Thank you for your consideration in this matter,

Rachel Kelley

Vernice Hankins

From: Linda Jassim <linda.jassim@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 25, 2020 2:26 PM
To: Rachel Kelley
Cc: Preferential Parking; councilmtgitems; kerry@riddleinc.com; tjclynch@mac.com; Anne Saldo; Candy Arnold; Casey Price; Charles Haynes; Dahli; David Barney; Denise Magilnick; George Bernota; Jane Dempsey; Jaspreet Kaur; Jennifer Lynch; Jill Elmore; Killeen C Pilon; Nate Taylor; Rick Mori; Susan Alinsangan; Tim Tunks; Vincent Esparza; zinajosephs@aol.com; gwynne@gwynnepugh.com; bp.doyle@mac.com; Jason Kligier; jojemi1@twc.com; Scott Johnson
Subject: Re: Preferential Parking 2/25 agenda item #11

EXTERNAL

I agree, but we got signatures for **Overnight parking permits** which is the main problem. When we come home at night, it is often difficult to find a parking space.

Please consider **Overnight permits** for the residents of Ashland Ave. - East of Lincoln Blvd.

Linda Jassim
linda.jassim@gmail.com

On Feb 25, 2020, at 2:22 PM, Rachel Kelley <rachelbernota@gmail.com> wrote:

Dear City Council Member,

I live on 10th Street, a cul-de-sac south of Ashland Avenue, and east of Lincoln Blvd. within the preferential parking boundaries.

What is needed:

- **overnight permit only parking.**
- **2-hour limit daily permit parking** (petitioned signatures).
- **Exclude permits to unbundled parking developments** (2903 Lincoln+802/810 Ashland).
- **Low income subsidy for one pass per affordable unit.**

Ashland Ave has reached parking saturation:

- **multi-family housing street: 8 single-family, 96 multi-family homes (46 are affordable units).**
- **47 street spots, 104 housing units with .451 parking spots per unit.**
- **Ashland is a sub-standard width street (28' wide) with "blind" hills creating parking/driving hazards.**

Parking activity here is already intense:

- **Red zone parking is common.**
- **Driveways wholly or partially blocked.**
- **Construction parking.**
- **LAX short-term parking.**

Please prevent all residential, retail and employee parking from 2903 Lincoln. This means evening/night parking as well.

Protect our dense neighborhood from parking hunting with driveway turnarounds and headlight intrusions.

We do not share the Planning Commission's enthusiasm about 2903 Lincoln "activating" our quiet "9-5 with schoolchildren" lives.

Please reconsider the technical denial from July 2019.

Santa Monica residents deserve the same courtesy extended to developers -the option to wait until the next meeting when there are only four Council Members voting.

Thank you for your consideration in this matter,

Rachel Kelley

Vernice Hankins

From: Preferential Parking
Sent: Tuesday, February 25, 2020 2:26 PM
To: councilmtgitems
Subject: FW: Resolution 11-A 02/25/20 meeting

From: Tim Tunks <tim.tunks@aol.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 25, 2020 12:49 PM
To: Preferential Parking <Preferential.Parking@SMGOV.NET>
Subject: Resolution 11-A 02/25/20 meeting

EXTERNAL

RE: "Zone F" Preferred Parking Scheme
Resolution 11-A Tuesday Feb. 25

To the Santa Monica City Council:

Please discard this ill advised "One size fits all" scheme the Planning Director is promoting. It fits no one well—except the Planning Department.

Read the tall stack of resident comments submitted with the July, 23, 2019 proposal and you will see the wide spectrum of opinions voiced by residents on the affected blocks—opinions ranging from "We definitely want no preferential parking" to "We need protection—but this plan doesn't provide what we need on our 700 Pier block."

Nobody said, "This is exactly the plan we need." This "One Size" obviously fall far short of fitting all.

A good example of the Director's heavy handed actions to push this inappropriate plan is how the properly filled 2018 petitions for Pier and Ashland blocks just west and east of Lincoln have dissolved—not because they were unjustified, but because they did not fit with the grand Zone "F" proposal.

In October, 2018, Planning staff Scott Johnson assured me during a phone call that all was in good order with the properly filed petition to ask the City council for some preferred parking relief from predictable pressures from the 2903 Lincoln project across the street from 700 block of Pier Ave.

By November, 2018, processing our petition stalled.

Here is Scott Johnson's email apologizing for not presenting our properly filed petition a month earlier.

From: Scott Johnson <Scott.Johnson@SMGOV.NET>
Subject: RE: 700 block Pier Av preferred parking
Date: November 20, 2018 at 5:46:57 PM PST
To: TIM TUNKS

Hi Tim,

Sorry for the delay in responding. This is still moving forward, but it's taking longer than expected as I was asked to do some additional parking review before proceeding. Based on the availability of getting on the City Council calendar I'm thinking of aiming for January to avoid holiday conflicts and maximize resident availability.

Scott

Then eight months later when the July 23, 2019 hearing agenda was published, we discovered that Scott Johnson's aim was at a different target. His thinking changed from filing our properly filed petition—but he didn't inform us.

The Planning Department had to make Pier and Ashland block's petitions disappear. The department's one size fits all scheme would be more difficult to pitch if Lincoln adjacent Ashland and Pier blocks were already awarded effective protection from the predictable assaults from 2903 Lincoln construction related personal vehicle parking.

The July 23 '19 staff report states, "Additionally, it is not anticipated that future street parking demand would deviate significantly from the trends shown in the recently conducted [2018] parking studies." I formally complained to the Director and two of his staff that this is a preposterous statement, as it totally ignores the completely predictable pressure presented by the 2903 Lincoln construction project that is now in final permit application phase—with the Construction Mitigation Plan not yet presented by the developer. The Director still stands by his risible claim, a claim unsupported by findings or reasoning.

This narrow strip of Lincoln Blvd. frontage will become a 35 foot deep hole for foundations and two levels of underground parking—a hole covering the entire building plot. That leaves zero room within the footprint for anything but construction.

So where will the dozens of employees, supervisors, inspectors, etc. visiting the site park their private vehicles? Where will their lunch boxes get stashed? Tools? Documents? Lots of stuff required to build a large complex project must be kept handy. Tally up the number of daily site visitors's private vehicles and imagine them cruising the neighborhood for a parking spot.

Neither of the properly filed 2018 petitions from Pier and Ashland have yet been presented to the City Council as promised.

The department had to make Pier and Ashland block's petitions disappear. Their one size fits all scheme would be more difficult to pitch if Lincoln adjacent Ashland and Pier blocks had already been awarded effective protection from the predictable assaults. The scheme wouldn't be one size any more.

When directly challenged, the Director continues to dismiss the 2903 Lincoln project from having any impact on parking on my block across the street from the project. How can effective solutions to site parking be found in the Director's atmosphere of complete denial? Don't we need offsite parking with efficient shuttle service supplied by the developer?

Tim Tunks
Pier Av.

Santa Monica 90405

Vernice Hankins

From: Preferential Parking
Sent: Tuesday, February 25, 2020 2:27 PM
To: councilmtgitems
Subject: FW: Preferential Parking Meeting Feb 25 at 6:30pm

From: Robert Ginsburg <robert@rsgcpa.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 25, 2020 12:17 PM
To: Preferential Parking <Preferential.Parking@SMGOV.NET>
Subject: Preferential Parking Meeting Feb 25 at 6:30pm

EXTERNAL

RE: Proposed preferential parking zone for area bounded by Highland Ave. , Ocean Park Blvd., 11th St., Glenn Ave, and the south City limit

Honorable Members of the City Council:

I am a semi-retired CPA and a long-time resident of Santa Monica, having raised my family and owned my home at 639 Pier Ave for over 35 years. I am writing to request that you not adopt the proposed preferential parking zone for the area generally bounded by Highland Ave, Ocean Park Blvd, 11th St, Glenn Ave, and the south City limit.

My objections are many, but for the sake of brevity I will make two points. The first is that, in my opinion, this entire request was made under false pretenses and is a case of bureaucratic excess. I attended the community meeting held May 16, at what was then known as Olympic High School. I happened to sit down next to two ladies who informed me that they were the ones responsible for requesting the proposed preferential parking, and had singlehandedly and with much effort managed to gather the signatures necessary from the residences on Ashland Ave and Pier Ave between Lincoln Blvd and Highland Ave. What I learned in the course of our conversation was that what motivated them to request this preferential parking zone was not that parking along that stretch of Ashland and Pier is now impacted, but that after the multi-occupancy project slated for the corner of Lincoln Blvd and Ashland Ave is completed, the influx of new residents will make parking there impossible. In their ignorance they did not realize that any new residents would be eligible for preferential parking permits too, that their interest in preserving parking exclusively for current residents was to no avail, and that all their work was, therefore, to no avail. But the train has left the station, and the bureaucracy charged with responsibility for providing preferential parking does what it has to do to justify its existence, expands the proposed preferential parking zone from two blocks to what it has now become, commissions a study which from my point of view is anecdotal and simply serves to justify a foregone conclusion (as a CPA I am a professional sceptic, and I don't need to be told that when given a choice between parking in a zone restricted to two hours and a zone without restrictions people will opt for no restrictions. No attempt to control for special circumstances or comps to other areas to establish standards was made). The legitimate objections made at that meeting related to parking involved compliance (Local businesses using street parking inappropriately, or using street parking for extended periods-supposed witnessed party taking a Lyft to the airport), or poor planning (two ongoing construction projects on Ashland at the same time adversely impacting locals' parking).

The second point I want to make involves me and fellow residents in my situation. I live in the area immediately outside the proposed preferential parking zone. As such, if the proposed preferential parking zone is approved, if and/or when there is a problem, I can expect that parking on my block will be more difficult because some people will choose to walk

the additional block for the advantage of no restrictions. If there is a problem, the problem has not been eliminated but has just been kicked down the road. You may say that I can gather the signatures for preferential parking for my block, but then the ultimate solution is preferential parking for the entire city. I believe that restricted parking should be used judiciously. No doubt residents near Main St, and downtown, where there are major influxes of visitors, deserve preferential parking. However, I question whether the density of businesses at this time along Lincoln Blvd attract enough visitors to require preferential parking. My conclusion from that meeting was that the reality at present is that existing residents are competing with their fellow residents for local parking spaces more than there is an invasion from the outside making it impossible to park. The solution, screaming at that meeting but never spoken, is fewer cars.

Your consideration of my opinions is greatly appreciated,

Robert Ginsburg

Vernice Hankins

From: Preferential Parking
Sent: Tuesday, February 25, 2020 2:28 PM
To: councilmtgitems
Subject: FW: Proposed preferential parking in Ocean Park

From: Peter Brady <pbrady317@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 25, 2020 10:55 AM
To: Preferential Parking <Preferential.Parking@SMGOV.NET>
Subject: Proposed preferential parking in Ocean Park

EXTERNAL

To the Santa Monica City Council:

Regarding the proposal to institute a preferential parking zone in the area bounded by Ocean Park Blvd to the north, the city border to the south, Highland Ave. to the west, and 11th St.-Glenn Ave. to the east: I live at the corner of Highland and Ashland avenues--on the western edge of the proposed preferential parking zone. In general, I am not opposed to the practice of restricted parking zones in certain residential areas of the city impacted by non-residents parking in those neighborhoods. However, I am concerned how this new restricted parking zone would impact available parking in the area immediately to the west of the restricted zone. There is already a restricted parking zone further west--starting at 4th Street and moving west toward the ocean. If the new restricted parking zone to the east is implemented, it would further reduce the availability of open parking in the non-restricted area between 4th St. and Highland Ave. Residents, such as myself who need to park on the street, would have an even harder time finding available daytime parking near our residences as their would be increased demand for those non-restricted spots. In addition, it would negatively impact individuals who are guests of residents in the remaining open parking area--especially those who are staying overnight. Lastly, the morning move time for those non-zone residents who are parking overnight in the restricted area will create that much more traffic and scrambling for parking spaces in the adjacent open parking area. I understand that those living in the proposed preferential zone need relief, but that relief should not come at the expense of those outside the zone. I would offer the following change to the plan as a way to create a more balanced solution:

In fairness to those living between 4th Street and Highland, and south of Ocean Park Blvd. to the city's southern boundary, if a new zone is to be implemented, it should cover the whole area west of Lincoln Blvd down to Main Street. Doing so will allow all residents in the area to maintain their current level of access to available parking and, through a reasonable issuance of guest passes, to provide for the needs of residents' guests. Thank you for taking the time to consider my comments.

Regards,

Peter Brady

Vernice Hankins

From: George Bernota <gbernota@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 25, 2020 2:35 PM
To: Preferential Parking; councilmtgitems
Subject: Re: Preferential Parking 2/25 agenda item #11

EXTERNAL

Dear City Council Member,

I live on 10th Street, a cul-de-sac south of Ashland Avenue, and east of Lincoln Blvd. within the preferential parking boundaries.

What is needed:

- **overnight permit only parking.**
- **2-hour limit daily permit parking** (petitioned signatures).
- **Exclude permits to unbundled parking developments** (2903 Lincoln+802/810 Ashland).
- **Low income subsidy for one pass per affordable unit.**

Ashland Ave has reached parking saturation:

- **multi-family housing street: 8 single-family, 96 multi-family homes (46 are affordable units).**
- **47 street spots, 104 housing units with .451 parking spots per unit.**
- **Ashland is a sub-standard width street (28' wide) with "blind" hills creating parking/driving hazards.**

Parking activity here is already intense:

- **Red zone parking is common.**
- **Driveways wholly or partially blocked.**
- **Construction parking.**
- **LAX short-term parking.**

Please prevent all residential, retail and employee parking from 2903 Lincoln. This means evening/night parking as well. Protect our dense neighborhood from parking hunting with driveway turnarounds and headlight intrusions. We do not share the Planning Commission's enthusiasm about 2903 Lincoln "activating" our quiet "9-5 with schoolchildren" lives.

Please reconsider the technical denial from July 2019. Santa Monica residents deserve the same courtesy extended to developers -the option to wait until the next meeting when there are only four Council Members voting.

Thank you for your consideration in this matter,

George Bernota

Vernice Hankins

From: stnepny@aol.com
Sent: Tuesday, February 25, 2020 3:18 PM
To: councilmtgitems
Cc: Scott Johnson
Subject: Preferential Parking for Ashland Ave east of Lincoln - Agenda Item 11

EXTERNAL

Dear City Council Member,

Please reconsider the technical denial from July 2019.

I live on Ashland Avenue, east of Lincoln. We Santa Monica residents would have really liked the same courtesy extended to developers-the option to wait until the next meeting-when there's only four Council Members voting.

Who we are:

- A multi-family housing street: 8 single-family, 96 multi-family homes (46 are affordable units).
- 47 street spots, 104 housing units with .451 parking spots per unit.
- We're a very narrow street

Our parking problems:

- Blocked driveways • Construction parking • LAX short-term parking

Protect our current parking misery from getting worse:

- Prevent retail and employee parking from 2903 Lincoln.
- Exclude permits to unbundled parking developments (2903 Lincoln+802/810 Ashland).

Our ask:

- 2-hour + overnight daily permit parking (our petitioned signatures).
- Exclude permits to unbundled parking developments (2903 Lincoln+802/810 Ashland).
- Low income subsidy for one pass per affordable unit.

My neighbors and I are anxiously looking forward to the meeting on Feb 25.

Kind Regards,
Charles Haynes III

Vernice Hankins

From: stnepny@aol.com
Sent: Tuesday, February 25, 2020 3:18 PM
To: councilmtgitems
Cc: Scott Johnson
Subject: Preferential Parking for Ashland Ave east of Lincoln - Agenda Item 11

EXTERNAL

Dear City Council Member,

Please reconsider the technical denial from July 2019.

I live on Ashland Avenue, east of Lincoln. We Santa Monica residents would have really liked the same courtesy extended to developers-the option to wait until the next meeting-when there's only four Council Members voting.

Who we are:

- A multi-family housing street: 8 single-family, 96 multi-family homes (46 are affordable units).
- 47 street spots, 104 housing units with .451 parking spots per unit.
- We're a very narrow street

Our parking problems:

- Blocked driveways • Construction parking • LAX short-term parking

Protect our current parking misery from getting worse:

- Prevent retail and employee parking from 2903 Lincoln.
- Exclude permits to unbundled parking developments (2903 Lincoln+802/810 Ashland).

Our ask:

- 2-hour + overnight daily permit parking (our petitioned signatures).
- Exclude permits to unbundled parking developments (2903 Lincoln+802/810 Ashland).
- Low income subsidy for one pass per affordable unit.

My neighbors and I are anxiously looking forward to the meeting on Feb 25.

Kind Regards,
Charles Haynes III

From: [Tim Tunks](#)
To: [Preferential Parking](#)
Subject: Resolution 11-A 02/25/20 meeting
Date: Tuesday, February 25, 2020 12:49:13 PM

EXTERNAL

RE: "Zone F" Preferred Parking Scheme
Resolution 11-A Tuesday Feb. 25

To the Santa Monica City Council:

Please discard this ill advised "One size fits all" scheme the Planning Director is promoting. It fits no one well—except the Planning Department.

Read the tall stack of resident comments submitted with the July, 23, 2019 proposal and you will see the wide spectrum of opinions voiced by residents on the affected blocks—opinions ranging from "We definitely want no preferential parking" to "We need protection—but this plan doesn't provide what we need on our 700 Pier block."

Nobody said, "This is exactly the plan we need." This "One Size" obviously fall far short of fitting all.

A good example of the Director's heavy handed actions to push this inappropriate plan is how the properly filled 2018 petitions for Pier and Ashland blocks just west and east of Lincoln have dissolved—not because they were unjustified, but because they did not fit with the grand Zone "F" proposal.

In October, 2018, Planning staff Scott Johnson assured me during a phone call that all was in good order with the properly filed petition to ask the City council for some preferred parking relief from predictable pressures from the 2903 Lincoln project across the street from 700 block of Pier Ave.

By November, 2018, processing our petition stalled.

Here is Scott Johnson's email apologizing for not presenting our properly filed petition a month earlier.

From: Scott Johnson <Scott.Johnson@SMGOV.NET>
Subject: RE: 700 block Pier Av preferred parking
Date: November 20, 2018 at 5:46:57 PM PST
To: TIM TUNKS

Hi Tim,

Sorry for the delay in responding. This is still moving forward, but it's taking longer than expected as I was asked to do some additional parking review before proceeding. Based on the availability of getting on the City Council calendar I'm thinking of aiming for January to avoid holiday conflicts and maximize resident availability.

Scott

Then eight months later when the July 23, 2019 hearing agenda was published, we discovered that Scott Johnson's aim was at a different target. His thinking changed from filing our properly filed petition—but he didn't inform us.

The Planning Department had to make Pier and Ashland block's petitions disappear. The department's one size fits all scheme would be more difficult to pitch if Lincoln adjacent Ashland and Pier blocks were already awarded effective protection from the predictable assaults from 2903 Lincoln construction related personal vehicle parking.

The July 23 '19 staff report states, "Additionally, it is not anticipated that future street parking demand would deviate significantly from the trends shown in the recently conducted [2018] parking studies." I formally complained to the Director and two of his staff that this is a preposterous statement, as it totally ignores the completely predictable pressure presented by the 2903 Lincoln construction project that is now in final permit application phase—with the Construction Mitigation Plan not yet presented by the developer. The Director still stands by his risible claim, a claim unsupported by findings or reasoning.

This narrow strip of Lincoln Blvd. frontage will become a 35 foot deep hole for foundations and two levels of underground parking—a hole covering the entire building plot. That leaves zero room within the footprint for anything but construction.

So where will the dozens of employees, supervisors, inspectors, etc. visiting the site park their private vehicles? Where will their lunch boxes get stashed? Tools? Documents? Lots of stuff required to build a large complex project must be kept handy. Tally up the number of daily site visitors's private vehicles and imagine them cruising the neighborhood for a parking spot.

Neither of the properly filed 2018 petitions from Pier and Ashland have yet been presented to the City Council as promised.

The department had to make Pier and Ashland block's petitions disappear. Their one size fits all scheme would be more difficult to pitch if Lincoln adjacent Ashland and Pier blocks had already been awarded effective protection from the predictable assaults. The scheme wouldn't be one size any more.

When directly challenged, the Director continues to dismiss the 2903 Lincoln project from having any impact on parking on my block across the street from the project. How can effective solutions to site parking be found in the Director's atmosphere of complete denial? Don't we need offsite parking with efficient shuttle service supplied by the developer?

Tim Tunks
Pier Av.
Santa Monica 90405

Vernice Hankins

From: June Stoddard <june.stoddard@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 25, 2020 4:51 PM
To: Preferential Parking; councilmtgitems
Subject: No to Preferential Parking on Highland Ave

EXTERNAL

Dear City of Santa Monica,

Please do not create a permit parking area in my neighborhood. This would greatly affect my life and be a problem for my neighbors.

NO to preferential parking.

My address is 2803 Highland Avenue. Having the streets surrounding mine open to parking is a great benefit for our neighborhood, and makes it feel neighborly.

June Stoddard

--

--

June Stoddard
310-721-4121 c
june.stoddard@gmail.com

Vernice Hankins

From: Preferential Parking
Sent: Tuesday, February 25, 2020 4:59 PM
To: councilmtgitems
Subject: FW: Preferential parking being considered again

From: Anne Herlihy <anne.herlihy@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 25, 2020 4:49 PM
To: Preferential Parking <Preferential.Parking@SMGOV.NET>
Subject: Preferential parking being considered again

EXTERNAL

To Whom It May Concern:

I received your email and appreciate your keeping us updated on this issue.

I remain against the proposed preferential parking.

Although I cannot speak to the potential impact for the section East of Lincoln, we will definitely be adversely affected on Marine Street just west of Highland where I live.

As I understand it, residents on streets with preferential parking can only park within a 2 block radius of their block, and streets nearby that do not have preferential parking (which would be us) would not have that same 2 block preferential parking access. The proposal would effectively sandwich us in between the existing PP zone from Main St to 4th St, and this new PP zone.

Our area would immediately inherit all of the spill over from those who could no longer park in the PP zone, particularly those who plan to leave a car parked for longer than the 2 hours allowed in the PP zone, or overnight.

We already get our share of people not living nearby who park for long periods (often moving the car only for street cleaning periods).

The 2 hour daytime limit proposed in the PP zone may help those parking to shop on Lincoln Blvd, and may make it easier for guests and workers to park without the inconvenience of a permit, but these are not the people who will be driven to Marine street to park.

I hope you will take this into account as you consider the proposal.

Thank you.

Anne Herlihy
615 Marine St.

Vernice Hankins

From: Preferential Parking
Sent: Tuesday, February 25, 2020 4:59 PM
To: councilmtgitems
Subject: FW: Preferential parking along 7TH & Highland south of Ocean Park

From: Nakatani, Lalida <lnakatani@dlrgroup.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 25, 2020 4:30 PM
To: Preferential Parking <Preferential.Parking@SMGOV.NET>
Subject: Preferential parking along 7TH & Highland south of Ocean Park

EXTERNAL

I do not agree.

I do not want permit to park on 7th street and Highland Avenue south of Ocean Park.

Lalida & Lindsey Nakatani
649 Copeland court #4
S.M. CA 90505

Lalida Nakatani, AIA
lnakatani@dlrgroup.com

DLR Group
Architecture Engineering Planning Interiors
o: 213-800-9400 | d: 213-444-1474 | m: 310-740-0615
700 South Flower Street, 22nd Floor Los Angeles, CA 90017
Find us at: dlrgroup.com | [Instagram](#) | [LinkedIn](#)

Vernice Hankins

From: Dan Peers <danpeers@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 25, 2020 5:00 PM
To: councilmtgitems
Subject: ITEM 11 Perferential Parking Zone

EXTERNAL

With my wife Jessica, I own and live at 1014 Wilson Place.

I had hoped to attend and comment at tonight's council meeting but I will have to email my concerns instead.

Parking on our street is in perfect equilibrium - residents are usually able to park on the street in front of our homes, but that does not leave many spots for guests. When patrons of the bar at the end of the block park here then residents must find parking elsewhere - i.e. in front of other people's homes on neighboring streets.

When 2903 Lincoln is built, I fear it will be almost impossible to regularly park in front of our own homes unless we are granted parking permits. Further, the proposed terms (daily 7AM to 6PM) do not help us much, as the street is mostly empty during the day when we take our cars to work.

It is imperative, in addition to the proposed rules (including limited guest passes), that ONLY RESIDENTS OF WILSON PLACE BE PERMITTED TO PARK OVERNIGHT ON WILSON PLACE. Also, that the developments at 2903 Lincoln and 802/810 Ashland be excluded.

Sincerely,
Dan Peers
1014 Wilson Place

Vernice Hankins

From: Rachel Kelley <rachelbernota@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 25, 2020 2:22 PM
To: Preferential Parking; councilmtgitems
Cc: kerry@riddleinc.com; tjclynch@mac.com; Anne Saldo; Candy Arnold; Casey Price; Charles Haynes; Dahli; David Barney; Denise Magilnick; George Bernota; Jane Dempsey; Jaspreet Kaur; Jennifer Lynch; Jill Elmore; Killeen C Pilon; Nate Taylor; Rachel Kelley; Rick Mori; Susan Alinsangan; Tim Tunks; Vincent Esparza; zinajosephs@aol.com; gwynne@gwynnepugh.com; linda.jassim@gmail.com; bp.doyle@mac.com; Jason Kligier; jojemi1@twc.com; Scott Johnson
Subject: Preferential Parking 2/25 agenda item #11

EXTERNAL

Dear City Council Member,

I live on 10th Street, a cul-de-sac south of Ashland Avenue, and east of Lincoln Blvd. within the preferential parking boundaries.

What is needed:

- **overnight permit only parking.**
- **2-hour limit daily permit parking** (petitioned signatures).
- **Exclude permits to unbundled parking developments** (2903 Lincoln+802/810 Ashland).
- **Low income subsidy for one pass per affordable unit.**

Ashland Ave has reached parking saturation:

- **multi-family housing street: 8 single-family, 96 multi-family homes (46 are affordable units).**
- **47 street spots, 104 housing units with .451 parking spots per unit.**
- **Ashland is a sub-standard width street (28' wide) with "blind" hills creating parking/driving hazards.**

Parking activity here is already intense:

- **Red zone parking is common.**
- **Driveways wholly or partially blocked.**
- **Construction parking.**
- **LAX short-term parking.**

Please prevent all residential, retail and employee parking from 2903 Lincoln. This means evening/night parking as well. Protect our dense neighborhood from parking hunting with driveway turnarounds and headlight intrusions. We do not share the Planning Commission's enthusiasm about 2903 Lincoln "activating" our quiet "9-5 with schoolchildren" lives.

Please reconsider the technical denial from July 2019.

Santa Monica residents deserve the same courtesy extended to developers -the option to wait until the next meeting when there are only four Council Members voting.

Thank you for your consideration in this matter,

Rachel Kelley

Vernice Hankins

From: Linda Jassim <linda.jassim@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 25, 2020 2:26 PM
To: Rachel Kelley
Cc: Preferential Parking; councilmtgitems; kerry@riddleinc.com; tjclynch@mac.com; Anne Saldo; Candy Arnold; Casey Price; Charles Haynes; Dahli; David Barney; Denise Magilnick; George Bernota; Jane Dempsey; Jaspreet Kaur; Jennifer Lynch; Jill Elmore; Killeen C Pilon; Nate Taylor; Rick Mori; Susan Alinsangan; Tim Tunks; Vincent Esparza; zinajosephs@aol.com; gwynne@gwynnepugh.com; bp.doyle@mac.com; Jason Kligier; jojemi1@twc.com; Scott Johnson
Subject: Re: Preferential Parking 2/25 agenda item #11

EXTERNAL

I agree, but we got signatures for **Overnight parking permits** which is the main problem. When we come home at night, it is often difficult to find a parking space.

Please consider **Overnight permits** for the residents of Ashland Ave. - East of Lincoln Blvd.

Linda Jassim
linda.jassim@gmail.com

On Feb 25, 2020, at 2:22 PM, Rachel Kelley <rachelbernota@gmail.com> wrote:

Dear City Council Member,

I live on 10th Street, a cul-de-sac south of Ashland Avenue, and east of Lincoln Blvd. within the preferential parking boundaries.

What is needed:

- **overnight permit only parking.**
- **2-hour limit daily permit parking** (petitioned signatures).
- **Exclude permits to unbundled parking developments** (2903 Lincoln+802/810 Ashland).
- **Low income subsidy for one pass per affordable unit.**

Ashland Ave has reached parking saturation:

- **multi-family housing street: 8 single-family, 96 multi-family homes (46 are affordable units).**
- **47 street spots, 104 housing units with .451 parking spots per unit.**
- **Ashland is a sub-standard width street (28' wide) with "blind" hills creating parking/driving hazards.**

Parking activity here is already intense:

- **Red zone parking is common.**
- **Driveways wholly or partially blocked.**
- **Construction parking.**
- **LAX short-term parking.**

Please prevent all residential, retail and employee parking from 2903 Lincoln. This means evening/night parking as well.

Protect our dense neighborhood from parking hunting with driveway turnarounds and headlight intrusions.

We do not share the Planning Commission's enthusiasm about 2903 Lincoln "activating" our quiet "9-5 with schoolchildren" lives.

Please reconsider the technical denial from July 2019.

Santa Monica residents deserve the same courtesy extended to developers -the option to wait until the next meeting when there are only four Council Members voting.

Thank you for your consideration in this matter,

Rachel Kelley

Vernice Hankins

From: Preferential Parking
Sent: Tuesday, February 25, 2020 2:26 PM
To: councilmtgitems
Subject: FW: Resolution 11-A 02/25/20 meeting

From: Tim Tunks <tim.tunks@aol.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 25, 2020 12:49 PM
To: Preferential Parking <Preferential.Parking@SMGOV.NET>
Subject: Resolution 11-A 02/25/20 meeting

EXTERNAL

RE: "Zone F" Preferred Parking Scheme
Resolution 11-A Tuesday Feb. 25

To the Santa Monica City Council:

Please discard this ill advised "One size fits all" scheme the Planning Director is promoting. It fits no one well—except the Planning Department.

Read the tall stack of resident comments submitted with the July, 23, 2019 proposal and you will see the wide spectrum of opinions voiced by residents on the affected blocks—opinions ranging from "We definitely want no preferential parking" to "We need protection—but this plan doesn't provide what we need on our 700 Pier block."

Nobody said, "This is exactly the plan we need." This "One Size" obviously fall far short of fitting all.

A good example of the Director's heavy handed actions to push this inappropriate plan is how the properly filled 2018 petitions for Pier and Ashland blocks just west and east of Lincoln have dissolved—not because they were unjustified, but because they did not fit with the grand Zone "F" proposal.

In October, 2018, Planning staff Scott Johnson assured me during a phone call that all was in good order with the properly filed petition to ask the City council for some preferred parking relief from predictable pressures from the 2903 Lincoln project across the street from 700 block of Pier Ave.

By November, 2018, processing our petition stalled.

Here is Scott Johnson's email apologizing for not presenting our properly filed petition a month earlier.

From: Scott Johnson <Scott.Johnson@SMGOV.NET>
Subject: RE: 700 block Pier Av preferred parking
Date: November 20, 2018 at 5:46:57 PM PST
To: TIM TUNKS

Hi Tim,

Sorry for the delay in responding. This is still moving forward, but it's taking longer than expected as I was asked to do some additional parking review before proceeding. Based on the availability of getting on the City Council calendar I'm thinking of aiming for January to avoid holiday conflicts and maximize resident availability.

Scott

Then eight months later when the July 23, 2019 hearing agenda was published, we discovered that Scott Johnson's aim was at a different target. His thinking changed from filing our properly filed petition—but he didn't inform us.

The Planning Department had to make Pier and Ashland block's petitions disappear. The department's one size fits all scheme would be more difficult to pitch if Lincoln adjacent Ashland and Pier blocks were already awarded effective protection from the predictable assaults from 2903 Lincoln construction related personal vehicle parking.

The July 23 '19 staff report states, "Additionally, it is not anticipated that future street parking demand would deviate significantly from the trends shown in the recently conducted [2018] parking studies." I formally complained to the Director and two of his staff that this is a preposterous statement, as it totally ignores the completely predictable pressure presented by the 2903 Lincoln construction project that is now in final permit application phase—with the Construction Mitigation Plan not yet presented by the developer. The Director still stands by his risible claim, a claim unsupported by findings or reasoning.

This narrow strip of Lincoln Blvd. frontage will become a 35 foot deep hole for foundations and two levels of underground parking—a hole covering the entire building plot. That leaves zero room within the footprint for anything but construction.

So where will the dozens of employees, supervisors, inspectors, etc. visiting the site park their private vehicles? Where will their lunch boxes get stashed? Tools? Documents? Lots of stuff required to build a large complex project must be kept handy. Tally up the number of daily site visitors's private vehicles and imagine them cruising the neighborhood for a parking spot.

Neither of the properly filed 2018 petitions from Pier and Ashland have yet been presented to the City Council as promised.

The department had to make Pier and Ashland block's petitions disappear. Their one size fits all scheme would be more difficult to pitch if Lincoln adjacent Ashland and Pier blocks had already been awarded effective protection from the predictable assaults. The scheme wouldn't be one size any more.

When directly challenged, the Director continues to dismiss the 2903 Lincoln project from having any impact on parking on my block across the street from the project. How can effective solutions to site parking be found in the Director's atmosphere of complete denial? Don't we need offsite parking with efficient shuttle service supplied by the developer?

Tim Tunks
Pier Av.

Santa Monica 90405

Vernice Hankins

From: Preferential Parking
Sent: Tuesday, February 25, 2020 2:27 PM
To: councilmtgitems
Subject: FW: Preferential Parking Meeting Feb 25 at 6:30pm

From: Robert Ginsburg <robert@rsgcpa.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 25, 2020 12:17 PM
To: Preferential Parking <Preferential.Parking@SMGOV.NET>
Subject: Preferential Parking Meeting Feb 25 at 6:30pm

EXTERNAL

RE: Proposed preferential parking zone for area bounded by Highland Ave. , Ocean Park Blvd., 11th St., Glenn Ave, and the south City limit

Honorable Members of the City Council:

I am a semi-retired CPA and a long-time resident of Santa Monica, having raised my family and owned my home at 639 Pier Ave for over 35 years. I am writing to request that you not adopt the proposed preferential parking zone for the area generally bounded by Highland Ave, Ocean Park Blvd, 11th St, Glenn Ave, and the south City limit.

My objections are many, but for the sake of brevity I will make two points. The first is that, in my opinion, this entire request was made under false pretenses and is a case of bureaucratic excess. I attended the community meeting held May 16, at what was then known as Olympic High School. I happened to sit down next to two ladies who informed me that they were the ones responsible for requesting the proposed preferential parking, and had singlehandedly and with much effort managed to gather the signatures necessary from the residences on Ashland Ave and Pier Ave between Lincoln Blvd and Highland Ave. What I learned in the course of our conversation was that what motivated them to request this preferential parking zone was not that parking along that stretch of Ashland and Pier is now impacted, but that after the multi-occupancy project slated for the corner of Lincoln Blvd and Ashland Ave is completed, the influx of new residents will make parking there impossible. In their ignorance they did not realize that any new residents would be eligible for preferential parking permits too, that their interest in preserving parking exclusively for current residents was to no avail, and that all their work was, therefore, to no avail. But the train has left the station, and the bureaucracy charged with responsibility for providing preferential parking does what it has to do to justify its existence, expands the proposed preferential parking zone from two blocks to what it has now become, commissions a study which from my point of view is anecdotal and simply serves to justify a foregone conclusion (as a CPA I am a professional sceptic, and I don't need to be told that when given a choice between parking in a zone restricted to two hours and a zone without restrictions people will opt for no restrictions. No attempt to control for special circumstances or comps to other areas to establish standards was made). The legitimate objections made at that meeting related to parking involved compliance (Local businesses using street parking inappropriately, or using street parking for extended periods-supposed witnessed party taking a Lyft to the airport), or poor planning (two ongoing construction projects on Ashland at the same time adversely impacting locals' parking).

The second point I want to make involves me and fellow residents in my situation. I live in the area immediately outside the proposed preferential parking zone. As such, if the proposed preferential parking zone is approved, if and/or when there is a problem, I can expect that parking on my block will be more difficult because some people will choose to walk

the additional block for the advantage of no restrictions. If there is a problem, the problem has not been eliminated but has just been kicked down the road. You may say that I can gather the signatures for preferential parking for my block, but then the ultimate solution is preferential parking for the entire city. I believe that restricted parking should be used judiciously. No doubt residents near Main St, and downtown, where there are major influxes of visitors, deserve preferential parking. However, I question whether the density of businesses at this time along Lincoln Blvd attract enough visitors to require preferential parking. My conclusion from that meeting was that the reality at present is that existing residents are competing with their fellow residents for local parking spaces more than there is an invasion from the outside making it impossible to park. The solution, screaming at that meeting but never spoken, is fewer cars.

Your consideration of my opinions is greatly appreciated,

Robert Ginsburg

Vernice Hankins

From: Preferential Parking
Sent: Tuesday, February 25, 2020 2:28 PM
To: councilmtgitems
Subject: FW: Proposed preferential parking in Ocean Park

From: Peter Brady <pbrady317@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 25, 2020 10:55 AM
To: Preferential Parking <Preferential.Parking@SMGOV.NET>
Subject: Proposed preferential parking in Ocean Park

EXTERNAL

To the Santa Monica City Council:

Regarding the proposal to institute a preferential parking zone in the area bounded by Ocean Park Blvd to the north, the city border to the south, Highland Ave. to the west, and 11th St.-Glenn Ave. to the east: I live at the corner of Highland and Ashland avenues--on the western edge of the proposed preferential parking zone. In general, I am not opposed to the practice of restricted parking zones in certain residential areas of the city impacted by non-residents parking in those neighborhoods. However, I am concerned how this new restricted parking zone would impact available parking in the area immediately to the west of the restricted zone. There is already a restricted parking zone further west--starting at 4th Street and moving west toward the ocean. If the new restricted parking zone to the east is implemented, it would further reduce the availability of open parking in the non-restricted area between 4th St. and Highland Ave. Residents, such as myself who need to park on the street, would have an even harder time finding available daytime parking near our residences as their would be increased demand for those non-restricted spots. In addition, it would negatively impact individuals who are guests of residents in the remaining open parking area--especially those who are staying overnight. Lastly, the morning move time for those non-zone residents who are parking overnight in the restricted area will create that much more traffic and scrambling for parking spaces in the adjacent open parking area. I understand that those living in the proposed preferential zone need relief, but that relief should not come at the expense of those outside the zone. I would offer the following change to the plan as a way to create a more balanced solution:

In fairness to those living between 4th Street and Highland, and south of Ocean Park Blvd. to the city's southern boundary, if a new zone is to be implemented, it should cover the whole area west of Lincoln Blvd down to Main Street. Doing so will allow all residents in the area to maintain their current level of access to available parking and, through a reasonable issuance of guest passes, to provide for the needs of residents' guests. Thank you for taking the time to consider my comments.

Regards,

Peter Brady

Vernice Hankins

From: George Bernota <gbernota@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 25, 2020 2:35 PM
To: Preferential Parking; councilmtgitems
Subject: Re: Preferential Parking 2/25 agenda item #11

EXTERNAL

Dear City Council Member,

I live on 10th Street, a cul-de-sac south of Ashland Avenue, and east of Lincoln Blvd. within the preferential parking boundaries.

What is needed:

- **overnight permit only parking.**
- **2-hour limit daily permit parking** (petitioned signatures).
- **Exclude permits to unbundled parking developments** (2903 Lincoln+802/810 Ashland).
- **Low income subsidy for one pass per affordable unit.**

Ashland Ave has reached parking saturation:

- **multi-family housing street: 8 single-family, 96 multi-family homes (46 are affordable units).**
- **47 street spots, 104 housing units with .451 parking spots per unit.**
- **Ashland is a sub-standard width street (28' wide) with "blind" hills creating parking/driving hazards.**

Parking activity here is already intense:

- **Red zone parking is common.**
- **Driveways wholly or partially blocked.**
- **Construction parking.**
- **LAX short-term parking.**

Please prevent all residential, retail and employee parking from 2903 Lincoln. This means evening/night parking as well. Protect our dense neighborhood from parking hunting with driveway turnarounds and headlight intrusions. We do not share the Planning Commission's enthusiasm about 2903 Lincoln "activating" our quiet "9-5 with schoolchildren" lives.

Please reconsider the technical denial from July 2019.

Santa Monica residents deserve the same courtesy extended to developers -the option to wait until the next meeting when there are only four Council Members voting.

Thank you for your consideration in this matter,

George Bernota

Vernice Hankins

From: stnepny@aol.com
Sent: Tuesday, February 25, 2020 3:18 PM
To: councilmtgitems
Cc: Scott Johnson
Subject: Preferential Parking for Ashland Ave east of Lincoln - Agenda Item 11

EXTERNAL

Dear City Council Member,

Please reconsider the technical denial from July 2019.

I live on Ashland Avenue, east of Lincoln. We Santa Monica residents would have really liked the same courtesy extended to developers-the option to wait until the next meeting-when there's only four Council Members voting.

Who we are:

- A multi-family housing street: 8 single-family, 96 multi-family homes (46 are affordable units).
- 47 street spots, 104 housing units with .451 parking spots per unit.
- We're a very narrow street

Our parking problems:

- Blocked driveways • Construction parking • LAX short-term parking

Protect our current parking misery from getting worse:

- Prevent retail and employee parking from 2903 Lincoln.
- Exclude permits to unbundled parking developments (2903 Lincoln+802/810 Ashland).

Our ask:

- 2-hour + overnight daily permit parking (our petitioned signatures).
- Exclude permits to unbundled parking developments (2903 Lincoln+802/810 Ashland).
- Low income subsidy for one pass per affordable unit.

My neighbors and I are anxiously looking forward to the meeting on Feb 25.

Kind Regards,
Charles Haynes III

Vernice Hankins

From: stnepny@aol.com
Sent: Tuesday, February 25, 2020 3:18 PM
To: councilmtgitems
Cc: Scott Johnson
Subject: Preferential Parking for Ashland Ave east of Lincoln - Agenda Item 11

EXTERNAL

Dear City Council Member,

Please reconsider the technical denial from July 2019.

I live on Ashland Avenue, east of Lincoln. We Santa Monica residents would have really liked the same courtesy extended to developers-the option to wait until the next meeting-when there's only four Council Members voting.

Who we are:

- A multi-family housing street: 8 single-family, 96 multi-family homes (46 are affordable units).
- 47 street spots, 104 housing units with .451 parking spots per unit.
- We're a very narrow street

Our parking problems:

- Blocked driveways • Construction parking • LAX short-term parking

Protect our current parking misery from getting worse:

- Prevent retail and employee parking from 2903 Lincoln.
- Exclude permits to unbundled parking developments (2903 Lincoln+802/810 Ashland).

Our ask:

- 2-hour + overnight daily permit parking (our petitioned signatures).
- Exclude permits to unbundled parking developments (2903 Lincoln+802/810 Ashland).
- Low income subsidy for one pass per affordable unit.

My neighbors and I are anxiously looking forward to the meeting on Feb 25.

Kind Regards,
Charles Haynes III

From: [Tim Tunks](#)
To: [Preferential Parking](#)
Subject: Resolution 11-A 02/25/20 meeting
Date: Tuesday, February 25, 2020 12:49:13 PM

EXTERNAL

RE: "Zone F" Preferred Parking Scheme
Resolution 11-A Tuesday Feb. 25

To the Santa Monica City Council:

Please discard this ill advised "One size fits all" scheme the Planning Director is promoting. It fits no one well—except the Planning Department.

Read the tall stack of resident comments submitted with the July, 23, 2019 proposal and you will see the wide spectrum of opinions voiced by residents on the affected blocks—opinions ranging from "We definitely want no preferential parking" to "We need protection—but this plan doesn't provide what we need on our 700 Pier block."

Nobody said, "This is exactly the plan we need." This "One Size" obviously fall far short of fitting all.

A good example of the Director's heavy handed actions to push this inappropriate plan is how the properly filled 2018 petitions for Pier and Ashland blocks just west and east of Lincoln have dissolved—not because they were unjustified, but because they did not fit with the grand Zone "F" proposal.

In October, 2018, Planning staff Scott Johnson assured me during a phone call that all was in good order with the properly filed petition to ask the City council for some preferred parking relief from predictable pressures from the 2903 Lincoln project across the street from 700 block of Pier Ave.

By November, 2018, processing our petition stalled.

Here is Scott Johnson's email apologizing for not presenting our properly filed petition a month earlier.

From: Scott Johnson <Scott.Johnson@SMGOV.NET>
Subject: RE: 700 block Pier Av preferred parking
Date: November 20, 2018 at 5:46:57 PM PST
To: TIM TUNKS

Hi Tim,

Sorry for the delay in responding. This is still moving forward, but it's taking longer than expected as I was asked to do some additional parking review before proceeding. Based on the availability of getting on the City Council calendar I'm thinking of aiming for January to avoid holiday conflicts and maximize resident availability.

Scott

Then eight months later when the July 23, 2019 hearing agenda was published, we discovered that Scott Johnson's aim was at a different target. His thinking changed from filing our properly filed petition—but he didn't inform us.

The Planning Department had to make Pier and Ashland block's petitions disappear. The department's one size fits all scheme would be more difficult to pitch if Lincoln adjacent Ashland and Pier blocks were already awarded effective protection from the predictable assaults from 2903 Lincoln construction related personal vehicle parking.

The July 23 '19 staff report states, "Additionally, it is not anticipated that future street parking demand would deviate significantly from the trends shown in the recently conducted [2018] parking studies." I formally complained to the Director and two of his staff that this is a preposterous statement, as it totally ignores the completely predictable pressure presented by the 2903 Lincoln construction project that is now in final permit application phase—with the Construction Mitigation Plan not yet presented by the developer. The Director still stands by his risible claim, a claim unsupported by findings or reasoning.

This narrow strip of Lincoln Blvd. frontage will become a 35 foot deep hole for foundations and two levels of underground parking—a hole covering the entire building plot. That leaves zero room within the footprint for anything but construction.

So where will the dozens of employees, supervisors, inspectors, etc. visiting the site park their private vehicles? Where will their lunch boxes get stashed? Tools? Documents? Lots of stuff required to build a large complex project must be kept handy. Tally up the number of daily site visitors's private vehicles and imagine them cruising the neighborhood for a parking spot.

Neither of the properly filed 2018 petitions from Pier and Ashland have yet been presented to the City Council as promised.

The department had to make Pier and Ashland block's petitions disappear. Their one size fits all scheme would be more difficult to pitch if Lincoln adjacent Ashland and Pier blocks had already been awarded effective protection from the predictable assaults. The scheme wouldn't be one size any more.

When directly challenged, the Director continues to dismiss the 2903 Lincoln project from having any impact on parking on my block across the street from the project. How can effective solutions to site parking be found in the Director's atmosphere of complete denial? Don't we need offsite parking with efficient shuttle service supplied by the developer?

Tim Tunks
Pier Av.
Santa Monica 90405

Vernice Hankins

From: June Stoddard <june.stoddard@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 25, 2020 4:51 PM
To: Preferential Parking; councilmtgitems
Subject: No to Preferential Parking on Highland Ave

EXTERNAL

Dear City of Santa Monica,

Please do not create a permit parking area in my neighborhood. This would greatly affect my life and be a problem for my neighbors.

NO to preferential parking.

My address is 2803 Highland Avenue. Having the streets surrounding mine open to parking is a great benefit for our neighborhood, and makes it feel neighborly.

June Stoddard

--

--

June Stoddard
310-721-4121 c
june.stoddard@gmail.com

Vernice Hankins

From: Preferential Parking
Sent: Tuesday, February 25, 2020 4:59 PM
To: councilmtgitems
Subject: FW: Preferential parking being considered again

From: Anne Herlihy <anne.herlihy@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 25, 2020 4:49 PM
To: Preferential Parking <Preferential.Parking@SMGOV.NET>
Subject: Preferential parking being considered again

EXTERNAL

To Whom It May Concern:

I received your email and appreciate your keeping us updated on this issue.

I remain against the proposed preferential parking.

Although I cannot speak to the potential impact for the section East of Lincoln, we will definitely be adversely affected on Marine Street just west of Highland where I live.

As I understand it, residents on streets with preferential parking can only park within a 2 block radius of their block, and streets nearby that do not have preferential parking (which would be us) would not have that same 2 block preferential parking access. The proposal would effectively sandwich us in between the existing PP zone from Main St to 4th St, and this new PP zone.

Our area would immediately inherit all of the spill over from those who could no longer park in the PP zone, particularly those who plan to leave a car parked for longer than the 2 hours allowed in the PP zone, or overnight.

We already get our share of people not living nearby who park for long periods (often moving the car only for street cleaning periods).

The 2 hour daytime limit proposed in the PP zone may help those parking to shop on Lincoln Blvd, and may make it easier for guests and workers to park without the inconvenience of a permit, but these are not the people who will be driven to Marine street to park.

I hope you will take this into account as you consider the proposal.

Thank you.

Anne Herlihy
615 Marine St.

Vernice Hankins

From: Preferential Parking
Sent: Tuesday, February 25, 2020 4:59 PM
To: councilmtgitems
Subject: FW: Preferential parking along 7TH & Highland south of Ocean Park

From: Nakatani, Lalida <lnakatani@dlrgroup.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 25, 2020 4:30 PM
To: Preferential Parking <Preferential.Parking@SMGOV.NET>
Subject: Preferential parking along 7TH & Highland south of Ocean Park

EXTERNAL

I do not agree.

I do not want permit to park on 7th street and Highland Avenue south of Ocean Park.

Lalida & Lindsey Nakatani
649 Copeland court #4
S.M. CA 90505

Lalida Nakatani, AIA
lnakatani@dlrgroup.com

DLR Group
Architecture Engineering Planning Interiors
o: 213-800-9400 | d: 213-444-1474 | m: 310-740-0615
700 South Flower Street, 22nd Floor Los Angeles, CA 90017
Find us at: dlrgroup.com | [Instagram](#) | [LinkedIn](#)

Vernice Hankins

From: Dan Peers <danpeers@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 25, 2020 5:00 PM
To: councilmtgitems
Subject: ITEM 11 Perferential Parking Zone

EXTERNAL

With my wife Jessica, I own and live at 1014 Wilson Place.

I had hoped to attend and comment at tonight's council meeting but I will have to email my concerns instead.

Parking on our street is in perfect equilibrium - residents are usually able to park on the street in front of our homes, but that does not leave many spots for guests. When patrons of the bar at the end of the block park here then residents must find parking elsewhere - i.e. in front of other people's homes on neighboring streets.

When 2903 Lincoln is built, I fear it will be almost impossible to regularly park in front of our own homes unless we are granted parking permits. Further, the proposed terms (daily 7AM to 6PM) do not help us much, as the street is mostly empty during the day when we take our cars to work.

It is imperative, in addition to the proposed rules (including limited guest passes), that ONLY RESIDENTS OF WILSON PLACE BE PERMITTED TO PARK OVERNIGHT ON WILSON PLACE. Also, that the developments at 2903 Lincoln and 802/810 Ashland be excluded.

Sincerely,
Dan Peers
1014 Wilson Place