

**Alex Medina**

---

**From:** Jeilers271 <jeilers271@aol.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, August 2, 2023 2:12 PM  
**To:** PlanningCommissioners  
**Subject:** Residential Parking vs. "Parklets"

**-EXTERNAL-**

I am concerned about residual parking for residents who live in the "Shore" area and the impact that "Parklets" on 2nd Street in the "Shore" will have.

I am a past president of the "Belmont Shore Improvement Association" and one of the main issues at that time was residential parking and the impact that restaurants and bars had on parking. I am sure that this is still a problem. At that time every restaurant and bar had a requirement to show that if they were to open or increase seating they had to exhibit that there was adequate parking to support the restaurant or bar seating/occupancy level.

Fast forward to today. Now restaurants and bars have been allowed to expand their seating when they expanded to "sidewalk dining" with no requirement to provide parking for the added "seating". The requirement to show adequate parking for an increase was abrogated somehow at the expense of residents.

Where will the added parking that will be needed for "Parklets" come from or is this not a problem?

I oppose "Parklets" on Belmont Shore's 2<sup>nd</sup> Street for the increased parking problems it will cause residents.

John Eilers

[REDACTED]

**From:** Joe Weinstein <jweins123@hotmail.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, August 2, 2023 2:36 PM  
**To:** PlanningCommissioners  
**Cc:** Alison Spindler-Ruiz; Maryanne Cronin; Melinda Cotton (mbcotton@hotmail.com); Glennis Dolce; Rae GABELICH; corlisslee@aol.com; julz.travels@yahoo.com; Brian Cochrane; jeff.miller@csulb.edu; CityClerk  
**Subject:** CARP Appeal vs Legends Encroachment (02 August 2023)  
**Attachments:** CARP Appeal vs Legends Encroachment (02 August 2023) .docx

**-EXTERNAL-**

## Citizens About Responsible Planning (CARP)

██████████ Long Beach Ca 90807 ██████████

[For the public record, and e-submitted with an attached MS-Word-format copy]

To: Long Beach Planning Commission

[PlanningCommissioners@longbeach.gov](mailto:PlanningCommissioners@longbeach.gov)

411 W. Ocean Blvd, 3d floor, Long Beach CA 90802

Subject: Appeal vs. proposed thoroughfare encroachment ('parklet') for *Legends* (Legends Long Beach Restaurant and Sports Bar):

Case no. 2302-02: 5236 E 2nd Street, on 3 August 2023 agenda

Dear Planning Commissioners:

Since our founding in 2015, Citizens About Responsible Planning (CARP) has worked to 'promote the quality of life in the City of Long Beach'. Toward this mission, we have focused on the duty of city government to practice and uphold responsible land use and planning.

We now appeal to the Commission the May 8 Zoning Administrator hearing decisions on this case.

### Why this appeal?

Our general concern is that, while temporary encroachments on public thoroughfares can at times be beneficial, long-term and permanent encroachments are very different: they risk the viability of the essential public mobility network on which everyday timely commerce and livelihood depend.

In this case, we also have a serious specific concern. Although many people have shared their perspectives, pro and con, on *Legends* operations, that topic is now of just secondary

importance. Your decision will impact the future not merely of *Legends* but of the entirety of Second Street in Belmont Shore.

That future is already problematic *without* any permanent ‘parklet’ encroachments. Second Street now serves two distinct and even mutually incompatible functions:

As a significant business and activity magnet, and

As an arterial for thru traffic, a prominent part of the City’s indispensable mobility network

This incompatibility of function, plus high traffic volumes – of cars, of trucks and of bikes and even pedestrians and their pets – frustrates all uses with congestion and even danger. For two instances: bike safety is problematic, and parking by business patrons and workers highly impacts nearby residential neighborhoods.

*If the proposed Legends encroachment is approved, equitable treatment of all establishments on Second Street - including but not limited to the many others which also seek ‘parklet’ encroachments - will require grant of equal encroachments to all!*

*The predictable result: yet greater congestion and frustration.* Current stresses will intensify - toward outright distress and conflict.

### **What is to be done?**

As Planning Commissioners your charge is not only to approve or otherwise *re-act* to proposals or appeals brought before you, but also to *pro-act*: to make useful recommendations to the City Council for needed planning efforts.

The future of Second Street calls for *affirmative planning*, not abdication of planning to *ad hoc* decisions on parklets or other sought individual permits. Second Street’s future calls for a comprehensive planning process, involving all categories of users and neighbors.

*That future can and should be more workable and agreeable to all parties than is either the existing congestion or the increased congestion and frustration created by doling out permits for parklet encroachments.* For just one possibility (among a variety of others): given careful planning which clearly specifies and develops arterial alternatives, Second Street might serve everyone better by being primarily a grand pedestrian mall, closed to arterial traffic of cars and trucks.

Cordially,

Joe Weinstein, President  
Citizens About Responsible Planning (CARP)