From: Tabitha Judson
To: Barnes, Lee; Bough, Andrea; Fowler, Dan; Lear, Teresa; Ellington, Brandon; Public Testimony; Public Engagement
Subject: letter of opposition (#221066 and #221067)
Date: Wednesday, December 14, 2022 8:07:06 AM
Attachments: page1image30492352.png
page1image30995168.png

Dear Honorable Members of City Council,

I am a resident, a homeowner and a business owner in Old Hyde Park. My home and my rental properties are all less than 500' from the proposed project at 1 W. Armour Blvd. I ***oppose*** this project. Please hold these plans in committee until this developer provides adequate parking.

Please remember the intent of 88-420 is to protect the needs of existing neighborhoods. Its reduced parking requirement is based on the project NEEDING LESS due to its proximity to and use of alternative forms of transportation. If any of its associated vehicles need to park on the street, then it is clear that THEY NEED MORE parking then they are providing, and this reduced parking provision ***should not apply*** to them.

The project will displace existing residents for several blocks to the north, west and south who *rely on the street as their only option for parking*. We are *unable* to add parking. In contrast, this developer has a 3-acre footprint to build on and can *easily self-support its parking needs*.

The only lifeline we will have if this plan proceeds is a ***rigid parking permit program*** that EXCLUDES all of this project's vehicles from the street parking and reserves it for the small apartment buildings and condos who rely on these spaces. This is a band-aid. Why not just require them to provide adequate parking now?

Old Hyde Park residents are being told we should "expect to walk 1-3+ blocks to get to our door" and that this is "good for us." This is not reasonable. It is not safe. And, none of this is good for us.

What are we getting from this? High-rises that are totally out-of-scale with our architecture, massive amounts of traffic, substantial loss of sunlight for those closest on west, and essentially, the 3500 block of Baltimore will turn into their alley. Bottom line is, we're getting nothing but a headache.

Nobody wants to invite the guy to the party who can't be bothered to BYOB. Why would we want this project moving in forever if they can't BYOP? *

88-420 - PARKING AND LOADING

88-420-01-A. The regulations of this article are intended to ensure provision of off-street parking and loading facilities in rough proportion to the generalized parking and loading demands of different land uses. By requiring such facilities, it is the intent of this article to help avoid the negative impacts associated with spillover parking into adjacent neighborhoods, while at the same time avoiding the negative environmental and urban design impacts that can result from parking facilities and other vehicular use areas.

88-420-01-B. The regulations promote flexibility and recognize that excessive off-street parking conflicts with the city's policies related to transportation, land use, urban design, historic preservation, and sustainability.

(Ord. No. 160454, § B, 6-22-2016)

Sincerely, Tabitha Judson

* BYOP = bring your own parking!