

Nawfal, Loyal

Subject: FW: 1050 Parker and 2700 Tenth St (Pardee block parking lot)

From: Stephen LaMond [mailto:lamond_stephen@comcast.net]
Sent: Tuesday, October 30, 2018 9:17 AM
To: Zoning Adjustments Board (ZAB) <Planningzab@cityofberkeley.info>; Nawfal, Loyal <LNawfal@cityofberkeley.info>; Sally Schifman <sschifman@rinconconsultants.com>
Cc: carly@carlyebenstein.com; Stephen LaMond <lamond_stephen@comcast.net>
Subject: 1050 Parker and 2700 Tenth St (Pardee block parking lot)

To whom it may concern:

We are a local small business owner and residents' of the area affected and known as 1050 Parker St. (Medical Bld) and 2700 10th Street-Pardee block PRIVATE parking lot

We Recently attended the meeting on October 25th 2018 and have some additional thoughts and follow-up concerning this project after sitting through the discussions. We have begun an additional outreach with local businesses and residents to insure that our thoughts and considerations are taken into account on this project. In general, we are interested in the project but want to make sure that this project is not the only consideration as we look to the entire West Berkeley revitalization moving forward. Thoughtful and well-planned projects with the future in mind, not just "one project at a time" but projects that add to the community as a whole both in aesthetics, access, accountability and job creation as well as job and business preservation.

We have several concerns:

1. **Local small business impact due to loss of sites for the Pardee block and the disproportionate benefit attributed to the developer for a rezoned area.**
 - a. It is felt that there should be ways to minimize this impact on the current small business owners working on this site planned for demolition
 - b. It is imperative that remuneration/relocation assistance is offered if in fact the PRIVATE parking lot succeeds
2. **We are concerned about local parking access for our small businesses and there really is no plan to address this except for highlighting that the "building meets specific parking standards" but doesn't address the increase in off-street parking by staff, patients and visitors to the building including vendors, lab services etc.**
 - a. We believe that the PRIVATE parking lot adds little benefit to this unique and growing Berkeley Enclave. If anything, it detracts from the area and in fact will likely reduce the already scarce parking that is currently available.
 - b. The local developer refutes this by stating that the health care facility will add 203 parking spaces overall
 - c. but under the same breath he is looking for a 10% reduction of available spaces, this is fuzzy math and illogical
3. **It was also described of the benefit of the West Berkeley shuttle to remove "Parking Burden locally"**
 - a. What we know currently is that the shuttle is useful but generally empty.
 - b. We dare say that a doctor or healthcare worker who may need to go to other Kaiser sites to travel to (surgery centers, hospitals, rounding etc.) would NOT benefit from a West Berkeley shuttle due to their

specific needs regarding need for rapid access to their transportation to attend to medical situations elsewhere.

- c. We are also concerned that “higher value” cars driven by higher paid healthcare workers are unlikely interested in parking in a semi-to unsecured parking situations somewhere else in Berkeley (BART, to avoid parking at a SECURED, DESIGNATED parking location provided by their employer.
- d. The crime in and around BART stations and parking lots is a fact of life. This includes regular car break-ins.
- e. It is felt that with a “vibrant” facility like this there will actually be a HEAVIER burden on parking in the area for both businesses and residents who already have significant issues with local parking.
- f. How frequently do we see patients waiting longer for their appointments or procedures which creates a patient backlog that is generally unforeseen but the developer would never have any insights into?
- g. It must also be remembered and it was not discussed at the recent public hearing is the fact that the facility will likely have hours of operation greater than most local businesses due to the type of services rendered at a Kaiser facility. Therefore, it is our contention that the hrs of operations are likely 7 AM to 8 PM each day with possible Saturday hours.
- h. Does the shuttle even go that long? We know it does in the AM but evening hours?

4. Parking Burden is growing from other distant and local businesses and housing developments Soon to be completed

- a. There are several larger multi-story apartment complexes almost completed in the San Pablo and 10th street area that will add more parking burdens that need to be addressed in any UNBIASED parking studies to be conducted and were recommended by the planning commission
- b. There is also the growth of Meyer Sound which has started to bring more “parkers” down several more blocks to leave their cars in our area. We have witnessed this over the past year. The bottom-line is that with more businesses coming into the area including this healthcare facility and more businesses growing internally/organically there is and will continue to be an unforeseen parking burden THAT Will not be resolved with the WEST BERKELEY shuttle alone.
- c. More planning for the entire area is our best bet to avoid future issues related to Zoning, parking, grossly oversized building developments or more housing developments that do not have insights into the vibrancy of West Berkeley.

5. Potential ideas:

- a. This development could undergo further evaluation and design that looks at more logical parking solutions; subterranean parking, plus one additional level, use of the 2600 Fantasy building parking lot with additional parking solutions. On any given day that lot is ½ to ¾ full. Adding a second deck or other feature could greatly alleviate Health care facility parking and the actual burden on local businesses impacted by this facility
- b. Having the ability to “encourage” the developer to rethink parking is critical, there is feasibility of subterranean parking if the building design would change. However I leave that up to the commission who likely understands design build issues better. What was concerning was the developers notion of just saying NO to everything and not working with the planning commission or community in general. It was a forced project from the get go, round peg in square hole concept.
- c. The actual “STAFF PARKING” considerations should also include access to parking for local businesses that remain in that building but also residents in the immediate block that would be impacted
- d. We would also insist on rezoning of area to allow for permit parking for residents and local businesses.
- e. There would potentially also be a benefit to reconfigure parking on 10th Street and part of 9th street to PERPENDICULAR parking vs. Parallel parking. This would greatly increase parking availability.
- f. There may be some benefit as well to creatively think about creating traffic flows with ONE WAY traffic on key access roads or side roads impacted with potential for beautification of the area.
- g. We also are concerned about the use of any chain link fencing around parking lots as that deteriorates over the course of time and is generally aesthetically unpleasing.

6. Finally, this area of West Berkeley continues to find its identity but in general the improvements with small businesses and the local comradery is evident. Each of us looking out for the others. We do not want to lose

that feel and think that Berkeley planning should really consider now on how best to grow this area into even a more vibrant community for the future. There is no reason not to start now. There is also a growing need for more local attractions and shops that make this area a potential high desirable area in the future.

Stephen LaMond and Carly Barker (Business owners and residents)

650-477-4043