

## Kristie Wheeler

---

**From:** Bill Utic <wau1@sbcglobal.net>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, February 10, 2016 4:10 PM  
**To:** Kristie Wheeler  
**Subject:** Pending Parking Code Change

KAREN WHEELER:

I am writing to oppose the proposed change in city code to allow up to 30 percent tandem or mechanized stacked parking in new developments.

In my experience, this is an unworkable solution outside a few high-rise downtown areas such as Manhattan in New York. Fremont is not Manhattan and never will be – nor should it.

Not everyone can use BART or other public transportation to commute to work, and public transportation is not an effective substitute for personal vehicles for shopping, entertainment and other needs.

Residents in new developments will still need and have vehicles. Generally, at least two vehicles per household and more if there are teens.

The proposed code change is unrealistic and will force more parking onto city streets, worsening the negative impacts to residents and neighborhoods associated with crowded on-street parking. For example, last week I was awakened in the middle of the night on three different days to unattended car alarms.

In my part of Fremont, there are lower density apartment and condo complexes on adjacent streets. Their parking overflows into the single family portion of the neighborhood and creates dangerous parking congestion at the intersections of cross streets near these complexes. When someone is hosting a gathering, guest parking overflows throughout the adjoining single family neighborhood, lining the streets and crowding driveways.

BILL UTIC, PE, AICP (retired)  
95 Viento Drive  
Fremont 94536

5. A

## Kristie Wheeler

---

**From:** DOUGCMCKAY@aol.com  
**Sent:** Friday, February 12, 2016 8:35 AM  
**To:** Bill Harrison; Suzanne Chan; Vinnie Bacon; Lily Mei; Rick Jones - Councilmember; jschob@fremont.gov; Kristie Wheeler  
**Subject:** Expressing concerns parking code change and curtailing personal vehicle use

To my elected Fremont City Council, Kristie Wheeler, and Jeff Schwob:

Publicly-elected Fremont officials for a city merely temporarily under their guidance are contemplating passing a requirement that higher-density developers NOT be required to provide adequate parking to meet citizens needs:

Upon assuming office, publicly-elected government officials have the fiduciary responsibility to: (1) determine citizens' assets; (2) secure those assets, (3) maintain those assets, and (4) pass those assets along "in like" or "in kind" to those who follow them in office.

If our Fremont City Attorney were asked to research it, I believe he would find that the City of Fremont is a non-profit municipal corporation with the same expectation to provide parking for its citizens as Target or Walmart has to provide parking for their customers. I believe he would also find our publicly elected trustees are sworn to uphold the Federal and State constitutions as a condition of employment. Federal and state constitutions as well as county and city regulations state that a resident has the right to enjoy their home as long as they do not impose upon the rights of other residents.

### Under current elected guidance:

- Freeway and street traffic is a nightmare. Citizens must drive on pot-hole filled roads and on city streets made visually and physically unsafe because of vehicles parked on both sides of those streets, endangering lives, creating extreme wear-and-tear on those streets maintained at citizens' expense, and creating extreme safety hazards in school and public park zones, especially when younger children are present.
- Our elected officials order by Municipal Code that individual citizens must maintain our City's sidewalks and street trees. If the City exercises control over sidewalks and street trees, then the elected officials have the fiduciary responsibility to maintain and deliver those assets "in like" or "in kind" to those who follow. Citizens **as a group** would also have responsibility for liability arising from those assets. Still, the City allocates funds to **new** construction while indicating it cannot afford sidewalk and street-tree maintenance.
- Who are our publicly-elected fiduciaries to tell the citizens they represent how to live our day-to-day lives regarding use of private automobiles versus public transportation? Is not elected government's duty to provide public services in the "**very best** interests of citizens"--not to act as dictators?
- Why must citizens suffer from lack of parking just so developers can profit from higher density construction?
- **Why is Fremont City staff's goal "to meet density requirements" instead of "to meet citizens needs"?** If **staff** cannot meet **their** density goals for new developments without using tandem or mechanized parking, would not citizens be required to buy equipment, shoulder property-damage liabilities, and pay for enforcement of such tandem and mechanized parking? How is that in citizens' best interests instead of in developers' best interests?

- **Is Fremont (1) a government of greedy politicians, (2) aiding greedy for-profit developers, (3) to generate inadequate revenue to cover increased citizens' expenses for additional infrastructure required? OR,**
- **Is Fremont a government of the people, by the people, and for the people?**

Thank you for your consideration,  
Faye McKay, Voting Fremont Citizen

## Kristie Wheeler

---

**From:** John Roberts <jacsonrob@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, February 10, 2016 7:47 AM  
**To:** Kristie Wheeler  
**Subject:** Parking

I wonder how many cars you have? I live on gatewood St and after the new tract was built, this street is full of cars parked from those homes that I'm sure have more than 1.7 cars !! Your thinking is not realistic for Fremont. And 1.3 !!!