

From: [D. Offen or G. Nyhan](#) [REDACTED]
To: [Ramirez, Lucas](#); [Hicks, Alison](#); [Abe-Koga, Margaret](#); [Kamei, Ellen](#); [Matichak, Lisa](#); [Showalter, Pat](#)
Cc: [City Council](#)
Subject: Item 6.2 on Feb. 14th Council agenda
Date: Monday, February 13, 2023 9:37:45 AM

CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL - Ensure you trust this email before clicking on any links or attachments.

Dear Councilmember,

The proposed ordinance changes for Item 6.2 seem to create more problems than it solves. We suggest that the Council make no changes now. After further assessment of all dimensions of the true situation, including input from all community stakeholders, a more thoughtful, careful proposal may or may not emerge. Once more safe parking is authorized, the issue created by the parking of occupied vehicles will decrease. Inconveniencing many more City residents, especially the disabled and seniors, for the sake of making police ticketing procedures easier, does not seem like a sensible tradeoff. Forcing people to constantly move their vehicles may only spread the effect of any parking problems further into other neighborhoods. Discriminatory enforcement based only on complaints may invite another possibly expensive lawsuit against the City. For all these reasons, we urge you to reject the proposed ordinance at this time.

Thank you for your patience and thoughtfulness in considering our views.

Long-time Mountain View homeowners,
Dave Offen & Gail Nyhan
[REDACTED]

From: [Karin, Bricker](#)
To: [City Council](#); [Hicks, Alison](#); [Showalter, Pat](#); [Ramirez, Lucas](#); [Kamei, Ellen](#); [Matichak, Lisa](#); [Abe-Koga, Margaret](#); [Emily Ann Ramos](#)
Cc: [McCarthy, Kimbra](#); [Glaser, Heather](#); [Logue, Jennifer](#)
Subject: LWVLAMV letter re: amendments to 72 hour parking
Date: Monday, February 13, 2023 1:08:20 PM
Attachments: [13 amendments to 72 hour parking.pdf](#)

CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL - Ensure you trust this email before clicking on any links or attachments.

From: [Jane Horton](#)
To: [City Council](#)
Subject: Feb 14 Council Meeting - Vehicle Parking Issue
Date: Monday, February 13, 2023 1:58:14 PM

CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL - Ensure you trust this email before clicking on any links or attachments.

Dear City Council and Mayor,

I am writing about the proposed change in vehicle parking which is going to be discussed during the February 14th City Council meeting.

I'm really concerned about the impact that having to move a car a thousand feet away from where it is normally parked would have on me and many of my neighbors.

When my car is parked in front of my house, I can keep an eye on it. I know where it is. I can walk out my front door and get in my car. If I had to park my car a thousand feet away from my house that means I would have to cross Flynn Avenue, cross Middlefield, cross Rogers Deli driveway, the 7-Eleven driveway, and multiple other driveways. A thousand feet from my house is almost down to Slater School's original campus. We only have parking on one side of the street here on the section of Whisman Road where I live. I couldn't see my car if it is parked 1000 feet away. I would have somebody else's car in front of my house.

But for elderly people, for handicapped people, making us have to move our car a thousand feet away is a huge burden and a huge hardship. It just turns into a game of Tetris where we play moving vehicles with our neighbors who then have to move their cvehicles someplace else. It is just baffling to me that this would even be considered for people who try to be good citizens but don't drive their cars every day and therefore will be punished for parking in front of their homes or apartments for more than 72 hours.

I'm retired. I go to the grocery store once a week and doctor's appointments weekly. The idea that I would have to park my car a thousand feet away if it stayed in the same place for 72 hours does not seem to me to be a good use of my taxpayer money (which incidentally I've been paying my taxes to the city of Mountain view for almost 50 years). I don't want to have to walk home late at night; I don't want to have to walk a thousand feet in the rain to go get to my car; I don't want to walk a thousand feet when I don't feel good. I don't want to walk a thousand feet only to find that my car has been vandalized. How would I have any guarantee that parking my car in front of a neighbor's apartment or house would be a secure and safe thing for my vehicle?

Currently with the new enforcement of the 72-hour parking, one has to look at their tires every day to make sure they haven't been chalked. Once they are chalked the vehicle has to be moved, but currently not 1000 feet.

MVPD does not ticket a vehicle once the tires are chalked. They just come to the vehicle and have it towed. I know this because it already happened to my nephew's vehicle. We did not realize the tires had been chalked. MVPD came with the tow truck driver and the vehicle was impounded.

I had a discussion with the police officers about how do they know if I've moved my car, I usually park my car in the same place and why don't they have to ticket a car before they tow it. I don't know how you members of city council feel about having to watch your tires every day to make sure that they're not chalked and if they're chalked having to move it to someplace that's a thousand feet away.

We have a situation now where people's cars are being towed without tickets because they've been parked for more than 72 hours in the same place. And then this proposal would add an additional burden. I don't know how long I am supposed to leave my vehicle when it is moved 1000 feet away. 24 hours? How is this going to be enforced? If I move it a thousand feet away for 24 hours and then bring it back how will the police know that I ever moved it?

I would like each of you to measure out a thousand feet from where you usually park your vehicle. And then think about having to move your vehicle a thousand feet away. It is not insignificant.

There are days when I am in so much pain that even walking out my front door and getting into my car is very difficult. I can't imagine on those days having to walk a thousand feet because I had my car parked in front of my house for 72 hours and got my tires chalked.

Having a vehicle towed is outrageously expensive and having to pay all the fees to get a vehicle back out after it's been towed for many of us that are on the fixed income, we would lose our vehicle. And of course when the vehicle gets towed you have to figure out where it's been stored and work with the tow yard to try to get your vehicle back.

This punishes lower-income people, as often you have multiple families living in the same place there's not room in the driveway to put everybody's vehicles. Vehicles get towed and people lose their vehicles. Why? Because they parked for 72 hours in front of their own residence? I understand that that's your policy but having to move your vehicle a thousand feet away is a huge burden and a huge hardship and I

certainly hope this is not passed because the amount of hardship and not even knowing whose house your car is parked in front of and how they're going to react. People are possessive about "their" spaces.

I don't want to have to put my car in front of some stranger's house or apartment. I don't think that's fair and I don't think that's reasonable. When I have had to park around the corner I usually get a note on my windshield asking me to not use "their" space.

My other concern is that this will not be enforced in the same way throughout the city. California Avenue and other apartment-dense areas will most likely be targeted, while the homes nearer to Los Altos will most likely never have their tires chalked.

Vehicle parking is a constant challenge in this city. Please do not make this more difficult by adding this 1000 foot rule.

Jane Horton

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Remember Who You Wanted to Be