

LARA WEISIGER

From: Jill Keimach
Sent: Thursday, April 28, 2016 7:21 AM
To: DEBBIE POTTER; Janet Kern; LARA WEISIGER
Subject: Fwd: Neighborhood Concerns about Project at 1435 Webster (on Your Agenda May 3)

Sent from my Verizon, Samsung Galaxy smartphone

----- Original message -----

From: Rob Siltanen <robsiltanen@gmail.com>
Date: 4/28/16 6:59 AM (GMT-08:00)
To: Trish Spencer <TSpencer@alamedaca.gov>, Frank Matarrese <FMatarrese@alamedaca.gov>, Tony Daysog <TDaysog@alamedaca.gov>, Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft <MEzzyAshcraft@alamedaca.gov>, Jim Oddie <JOddie@alamedaca.gov>
Cc: ANDREW THOMAS <ATHOMAS@alamedaca.gov>, City Manager <MANAGER@alamedaca.gov>, Jill Keimach <JKeimach@alamedaca.gov>
Subject: Neighborhood Concerns about Project at 1435 Webster (on Your Agenda May 3)

Mayor Spencer, City Council Members, City Manager Keimach, and City Planner Thomas,

The proposed project for 1435 Webster presents real, specific challenges and concerns for our neighborhood. I believe you will be having a public hearing on this project at your meeting on May 3, but since I am unable to attend the meeting I hope you will give this email the same consideration you would give any public comment made at the public hearing next week. I don't know how many other areas residents will contact you, but I can assure you that the concerns I'm sharing here are shared by our neighbors here where we have lived for more than 20 years.

As you are aware, the current proposal is for fewer parking spaces than are required under the city's own guidelines based on the number of residential units in the project. If the plan for this project is not changed and you approve it despite its failure to meet the city's own parking guidelines for residential development, your approval would mean this project will maximize profit for the developer while dumping the parking overflow that the project will cause onto a neighborhood where parking is already a significant and growing problem.

In addition to not complying with the City's own guidelines for the residential element of the project, it isn't clear (at least to me) whether the plan allocates ANY parking for the ground level retail in the new "mixed use" plan. Instead, it seems as though the number of parking spots included for this new building may be based solely on the number of residential units, with no parking provided for the new commercial uses. Not everyone patronizing those new retail establishments will walk, ride or use public transit to get there. Where are they going to park?

Until there is a realistic, non-utopian solution to the area's parking problems (i.e., more than "well, everyone will just walk, bike and take the bus"), it is reasonable for Webster area residents already dealing with parking issues to insist that new developments here in this densely populated, already-built-up area include adequate

parking (a) as happened around Park Street with the construction of the large parking garage or (b) within each project itself, by requiring that sufficient parking be included. In other words, this building plan could and should be modified so there is adequate parking associated with it, either (a) nearby by the creation of additional parking or, since that seem highly unlikely to occur in the near term, (b) by requiring that the project be redesigned to include more parking (which is do-able and would just mean cutting the developer's profit margins a bit).

Lastly, I would like to request that whatever your respective views may be of the general effects of the various large development projects proposed and underway elsewhere involving hundreds of housing units on the northern waterfront, at former North Housing/Coast Guard housing, at Alameda Point, or elsewhere, please keep in mind that the impact of this particular nine unit Webster Street project on rental rates or housing availability city wide will be zero, whereas the negative impact on this specific neighborhood of a project with insufficient parking will be very significant. Accordingly, please evaluate this project on its own merits in the specific context here where it is happening and please give serious consideration to the real, specific negative aspects of the current plan.

Please do not make this project a pawn or a proxy in the broader political/ideological fights happening in Alameda about the appropriate pace and nature of development. Your decision in this case is just about 1435 Webster. The facts here are that parking is currently a big problem in this neighborhood and this project as proposed would make it much worse. With some changes to the project and a slight reduction in the developer's profit, it seems likely a revised version of this project could be made to work, but please do not approve this project as currently proposed.

Thank you for your consideration.

- Rob Siltanen
636 Santa Clara Avenue

LARA WEISIGER

From: gerstle@mindspring.com
Sent: Saturday, April 23, 2016 12:13 PM
To: Trish Spencer; Frank Matarrese; Jim Oddie; Tony Daysog; Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft
Cc: LARA WEISIGER
Subject: 1435 Webster Street
Attachments: 645-647 Taylor.JPG; 1712Webster.JPG

Dear Mayor and Council,

I am writing regarding the proposed development at 1435 Webster Street which appears on your next council agenda.

Reducing parking does not reduce the demand for parking. Immediately adjacent to the proposed development, the front yards have been paved over for parking. In one case, this happened very recently. It was reported to Code Enforcement, but no effective action has been taken. Similarly, the front yard of the historic home at 1712 Webster Street was paved over for parking several years ago. This was reported to Code Enforcement, but no effective action has been taken. The City lacks the means to enforce its codes and it appears that anyone can pave over property for parking without significant negative consequences.

Also, the City has conducted its own study of the Webster Street area which shows that there is a parking crunch during certain times. The lot at 1435 Webster Street used to be a City parking lot. Its closure left a single City parking lot in the area. That lot is partially closed on Tuesdays and Saturdays for the farmers' market.

The City has a parking garage and other municipal parking lots near Park Street. One of the reasons for building the parking garage was to bring prosperity to downtown through increased business. Why don't those same rules apply to Webster Street? If increased parking will bring prosperity to the East End, why doesn't the West End get to share in that prosperity?

Reducing parking will not reduce the number of vehicles; they will simply impact the adjacent neighborhoods and bring more illegal parking which will negatively impact the community. Walking past front yards with parked vehicles does not enhance the pedestrian environment. Reducing parking spaces does not reduce parking demand. I urge you to reflect on your decision and what would be accomplished by cutting parking requirements.

Sincerely,



04/23/2016 11:10



04/23/2016 11:00