

**From:** Philip McMillion <[philmcmill@yahoo.com](mailto:philmcmill@yahoo.com)>

**Sent:** Friday, August 31, 2018 4:26 PM

**To:** Planning <[Planning@a2gov.org](mailto:Planning@a2gov.org)>

**Cc:** Kowalski, Matthew <[MKowalski@a2gov.org](mailto:MKowalski@a2gov.org)>; Smith, Chip <[ChSmith@a2gov.org](mailto:ChSmith@a2gov.org)>; Warpehoski, Chuck <[CWarpehoski@a2gov.org](mailto:CWarpehoski@a2gov.org)>

**Subject:** Follow-up PARKING PROBLEMS for PROPOSED Lockwood packet PC Sept. 5, 2018

I just met today (8/31/18) for several hours with Matt Kowalski and Brett Lenart to talk about the parking problems with the proposed Lockwood project. It is unfortunate that I was unable to meet with them earlier, but it was still a useful meeting. Matt mentioned he will immediately contact the developer (Lockwood) to discuss their overflow parking strategy. Brett mentioned he will talk at the planning commission meeting on 9/5/18 to address the number of anticipated visitors (and visitor parking), how to reconcile the lack of parking that Lockwood has documented versus what they have verbally said is no problem, and also what Lockwood's overflow parking strategy is.

I really want to address this email to the Planning Commission itself on their lack of responsiveness to my previous emails and my talk at the last Planning Commission meeting on 5/1/18 regarding the parking problem. While I laud the Planning Commission on their efforts in general to reduce the amount of parking (for environmental reasons) in the city, without addressing minimum standards, they are creating unnecessary problems by not addressing adequate parking. I was disappointed with the Planning Commission after this project was tabled in May that they did not list the parking problem as a major problem. Brett and Matt admitted they have no specific guidelines for specifying a threshold for peak parking and admitted they have no minimum standards for PUD parking. Using Lockwood's own numbers and estimates, I showed how they are **UNABLE TO SUPPORT DAILY PARKING** requirements, are way below their own PEAK parking threshold (65 vs. 86), and **HAVE NO OVERFLOW PARKING** strategy.

To recap, Lockwood's own estimates that they provided on eTrakIt show 65 parking spaces available. Subtract 6 spots for handicap parking, 2 for charging station, 2 for Dolph parking, that leaves **55 parking spaces non-handicap parking available**. Lockwood's estimate is around 40 resident vehicles and 15-18 employee vehicles, **requiring 55-58 parking spaces for residents and staff**. That is not enough for daily parking and **NO ROOM FOR ANY VISITORS**.

My concern is that the Westover Hills neighborhood will bear the brunt of overflow parking, creating problems for residents and residents/staff/visitors of Lockwood (since most of the Westover Hills neighborhood does not allow street parking and cars can be ticketed and/or towed). In addition, cars circling the area looking for parking could create additional traffic issues and generate unnecessary air and noise pollution.

Lockwood's own estimates (that they provided to eTrakIt) show they cannot adequately handle daily parking and have no overflow parking strategy. Please push back and address this!

Thanks.

Sincerely,  
Phil McMillion  
133 Westover 48103