

Lapira, Katrina

From: Kevin Dumler <kwumler@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 6, 2020 9:40 AM
To: Greene, Elizabeth
Cc: Davila, Cheryl
Subject: Southside EIR: Support

Hi Elizabeth,

I wanted to express my support for the Southside EIR that went before the planning commission last night.

I think increasing housing options for in this area is a real win for students and the city at large. As indicated in the agenda item, the neighborhood is blessed with density and development patterns that facilitate walking and biking. Increasing housing opportunities in neighborhoods like Southside is critical to meeting our housing needs and our climate goals. Other aspects of the plan, like removing parking minimums, offer opportunities for development that better fit this walkable neighborhood.

The prospect of more buildings that are in the 12 story range is an exciting opportunity. Existing buildings in the area like Units 1 and 2 show this is an existing building form that is compatible within the community.

I am not familiar with the original Southside Plan, but if future development activities could be coordinated with planned and proposed changes in streets that support alternative modes, that would be ideal. Most streets in this area allocate far too much space to cars and far too little to bicycling and walking given their abundance (Bancroft and Telegraph in particular).

I am looking forward to reviewing the draft EIR. Thank you for spearheading this project.

Kevin Dumler
District 2

cc: Cheryl Davila

Lapira, Katrina

From: Carl Gold [mailto:carl.gold@zuora.com]

Sent: Wednesday, February 12, 2020 12:41 PM

To: Pearson, Alene <apearson@cityofberkeley.info>

Subject: Public hearing on Proposed Transportation Demand Management Program and Reduction of Parking Requirements

I support the plan to remove parking requirements. Many Californians view it as their god given right to park right at their destination, but really parking is a privilege. And maintaining that privilege comes with a cost to the environment and housing availability. My only concern is does Berkeley have the necessary infrastructure for people to get around town in a world where most people don't have cars of their own? We're not suddenly going to have a new york style subway system. Will new alternatives like scooter rental and ridesharing fill this gap? Or is new public transportation planned? Also, thought should be given to allowing new, small commercial districts to help people meet their usual needs within their own neighborhood and without driving.

Lapira, Katrina

From: Milo Trauss [mailto:milotrauss@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, February 13, 2020 9:31 AM
To: Pearson, Alene <apearson@cityofberkeley.info>
Subject: Southside Plan EIR

Dear Planning Commission,

I am writing in support of the zoning changes to allow for decreased parking, increased density, increased lot coverage, increased building heights and streamlined approvals in the Southside Plan as described here:

Table 3 Proposed Zoning Ordinance Modifications

<https://discuss.eastbayforeveryone.org/uploads/default/original/1X/417df5bc7534ce810e6b09619cdab6c2b096ea00.png>

I understand you are facing pressure from some members of the community to reverse these changes and instead maintain the status quo of low housing production and painstakingly long approval processes. We know how the status quo planning and approval mechanisms have failed Berkeley. The city is suffering from homelessness, high housing costs, and unnecessarily high green house gas emissions by drawing employees who are traveling great distances by car from other parts of the bay to participate in our economy. We need these workers and we should be housing them here.

Thank you for your consideration, and your courage. It is difficult to buck the interests of land owners whose highest priority is preserving their wealth and advantage.

Best,
Milo Trauss

Lapira, Katrina

From: Pearson, Alene
Sent: Friday, February 21, 2020 9:08 AM
To: Lapira, Katrina
Cc: Horner, Justin
Subject: FW: Parking Standards, Agenda of May 4, Planning Commission

Katrina:
Here's a communication for the March 4 PC meeting.
Thanks!

From: Charles Siegel [mailto:siegel@preservenet.com]
Sent: Thursday, February 20, 2020 5:43 PM
To: Pearson, Alene <apearson@cityofberkeley.info>
Cc: Horner, Justin <JHorner@cityofberkeley.info>; siegel@preservenet.com
Subject: Parking Standards, Agenda of May 4, Planning Commission

To: Planning Commission
Re: Parking Standards, Agenda of May 4

I support the proposal to eliminate parking requirements for new residential development. Housing will be more affordable if we do not require developers to build such excessive parking that many spaces are empty.

But I think the measure would be better with this addition:

Residents of buildings that do not include on-site parking for residents and that are in Residential Permit Parking areas should not be able to purchase on-street parking stickers. Building owners should be required to inform potential renters or buyers that there is no on-site parking and they will not be able to get permits for on-street parking, so the housing is suitable only for people who do not have cars.

This would create car-free housing, housing for people who do not own cars, which would have clear environmental and political benefits.

Environmental Benefits:

It would create an incentive for people not to own cars by treating them fairly, rather than requiring them to subsidize those who have cars. Currently, the parking requirement raises rents for everyone, including those who do not have cars; even if the parking is unbundled from the rent, owners cannot charge enough to cover the construction of the parking. It is only fair for people who don't own cars to be the ones who benefit from the lower cost of housing without on-site parking. We should not let this housing fill up with people who have cars and park on the street, so fewer units are available to people who don't have cars. Automobiles are the number-one source of greenhouse gas emissions in Berkeley, so we should not penalize people who don't have cars by making them pay higher housing costs to subsidize those who do have cars; instead we should make this lower-cost car-free housing available to people who do not have cars.

Political Benefits:

There will be less opposition to new housing if future residents of proposed housing cannot compete for existing on-street parking. Existing residents often oppose new housing near their homes or demand that it provide on-site parking because they don't want to worsen the scarcity of on-street parking; with this provision,

we could tell them that that they don't have to worry because the residents of the new housing will compete for existing on-street parking. Likewise, I think there may be strong opposition at the council level to this proposal to revise parking standards if people think it will worsen the shortage of on-site housing; we would do well to head off this opposition by restricting RPP permits.

In summary, please do pass the proposal to eliminate parking requirements for new residential development, and please add a provision saying that residents of new buildings with no on-site parking for residents should not be eligible for RPP.

Thanks,
Charles Siegel

Lapira, Katrina

From: Candace Hyde-Wang [mailto:candacehw@gmail.com]

Sent: Tuesday, February 25, 2020 9:22 AM

To: Pearson, Alene <apearson@cityofberkeley.info>; Wengraf, Susan <SWengraf@cityofberkeley.info>; Kate Harrison <kate@kateharrisonconsulting.com>

Subject: Berkeley's New Housing

Hi!

I want to speak out against the City giving permits to housing without parking. This is a handicapped issue because increasing traffic and parking density will make it more difficult for access-challenged people to get around. There are many seniors who depend on cars (also mothers with children, etc.) as well as many areas of our city, like hillside areas, that require them. Realistically, we need to provide for them. I suggest that not to maintain adequate parking close to BART, shopping and other venues, is to deny the needs of people with limited mobility and their equal access to facilities. And parking is not adequate now. How much worse should it get?

Berkeley has for decades been one of the most densely populated cities in California. The realistic, not ideal, analysis of its' citizens needs is important.

Thank you.



Candace Hyde-Wang - GREEN
Realtor® • #983422
510.541.4661
1575 Hopkins Street, Berkeley, CA 94707
candacehydewang.com • **GOOD MOVE.**
www.linkedin.com/in/candacehydewang