

Downtown Parking Recommendations Comments and Suggestions

Proposed Change 1: Convert Third Street between Main and Furnace Streets to one-way (north bound) and add 10 parking stalls on the east side of the street.

- One way Third Street would be bad for business as in the letter given to Howard 10-19-17 with a map of area. - Allegiant Oil LLC Platteville
- As the owner of A-C Services, on 150 N 2nd St-the proposed North bound Traffic on 3rd Street would take away 80% of customer access and eliminate service and big truck delivery. This is not acceptable to me! This would severely hurt business. Please call me at 348-6487.
- Do not make 3rd one way.
- Do not agree. Not sure the parking spots gained are worth the inconvenience of the 1 way. Also concerned with the 3rd street parking lot traffic trying to get in and out of the parking lot.
- Agree with the change.
- Does anyone want another one-way street in the city's downtown? And then only two blocks in the middle of that six-block street?
- Agree with the change in direction. Will the 10 spaces be overnight or no parking 3-6 AM?
- I think there are too many one way streets now! If any street should be one way it should be from Pine to Main!
- Ok.
- The street is hardly big enough for two way traffic, I support this
- The street is already too narrow to be anything other than a one way. It needs to become one to prevent accidents.
- Seems Reasonable.
- Good idea. It is crazy being a narrow two way street with parking.

Proposed Change 2: Convert the 24-Hour parking stalls in the Mineral Street, Post Office, and Oak Street lots to leased parking.

- Don't agree. We don't want leased parking in our downtown business area limiting our shoppers parking. Also, would hate to see empty spots that are leased that can't be used when the leaser is gone. We also realize the leased spots are not being used that you have marked now. There are still 20 spots now that people aren't leasing.
- Agree with the proposed change. Convert all of the Rountree parking lot next to Piggly Wiggly to leased parking.
- Consider the lease contract for these stalls to address the frustration that those spots would be open for the majority of business hours. Please consider the option of allowing for the public to park in those spaces for an agreed upon portion of the day? Agree with the proposed option that if a spot is not leased then it reverts back to the 3 hr or no parking 3-6 am.
- Leased parking changes public parking to private. It makes downtown parking worse and the City knows this. There have been 39 parking spaces available for lease for years. It seems the Task Force/City staff/Common Council is withholding this information and misleading the public. It would be simple for City staff to report how much money was collected in parking space fees from 2013 to 2017. An estimate (from simple observation) is that only about 25% of those 39

parking spaces have been leased. That means about 30 parking spaces are empty and no one can use them. Let me repeat what I wrote/said about downtown parking way back on September 24, 2013: "A downtown parking space should be available to multiple users. A downtown parking space used by only one and sitting empty the rest of the time makes no sense. A downtown parking space that is not used as fully as possible is a waste. 27 downtown parking spaces not used at all is a parking problem."

- Imagine someone saying to you "If you want to keep living where you are, you better give us \$360 at once, because if you don't were going to take away every other option you have and make it illegal if you don't." That's exactly what you are doing to me (A non college resident, living alone downtown) with charging for overnight parking. I've been doing research and there are hardly any communities, especially one this small that don't offer free overnight parking somewhere in their town/city. The ones that do offer paid overnight parking as a supplement option charge considerably less and provide many other payment options than you do. Even at half the cost this plan would still be considered expensive. That's how overpriced the proposal is. If you had built a parking garage and needed to pay for that, I could understand charging for parking. But sometimes you have to just make the investment at your cost for the good of all downtown (the businesses, the people who work downtown, the shoppers + residents). I also believe the overnight parkers are gone to work during the key times you need spots open downtown anyway and aren't as much of the cause of the problem as they seemed to be blamed for. This is the only are of the parking proposal I am commenting on because I believe its the most neglected + misunderstood. I have lost sleep worrying how I'm going to afford a parking pass or how I'm going to find another place to live in my budget, if I'm forced to move. I don't know what's going to happen to me if there is nothing but paid overnight parking downtown. It's very difficult to live downtown as it is already, please don't make it worse.
- How many parking stalls are needed for residents? (Stalls are longer term parking) Agree with the conversion to lease parking.
- Those that have been parking in this lot (postal workers especially) will now park on Court Street, street parking and the Old National Bank staff has been parking there often.
- Converting 24 hr stalls to paid is called "gentrification" whereby only the rich are given parking privileges. Public stalls should be available for all of the people. I would support enhanced enforcement of 24-stalls.
- I think there should be more 24hr parking spots around town, not fewer
- This is terrible. It's making students pay for parking that is currently free, and displacing so many parking spots. Anyone living on main street will now have to park even further away. There is a lack of free parking, not a lack of parking. Taking away free parking and making people pay for it is disgusting. While it would be very nice for the few people who lease those spots, the majority would have to park further away.
- **Not supportive of charging for parking in this lot.**
- Wrong. There are many who rent apartments down town. Parking is already an issue. This will deny overnight parking to tenants. When I lived downtown I was able to park in the Rountree lot, but then the city instituted permit parking. I then had to pay Mound City Bank for a rented stall. This only benefits the city of Platteville, not residents of downtown. The problem is not trying to find parking to visit businesses during the day, but trying to find overnight parking when you live on Main Street. I'm not sure the committee understands the issue.

- Use daily meters, why give preference to one person and not all equally
- Shown on the parking map, what is leased/3 hour parking?

Proposed Change 3: Reconfigure the Mineral Street lot.

- Don't agree. Don't fix if it's not broken. We know of very few accidents backing out into the street. There will be more accidents backing into each other with the new configuration. Very concerned about snow removal with the new design - you have limited \$, so please just resurface the existing lot as it is.
- Assume reconfiguration is suitable.
- Re configuring these lots does not gain any additional stalls. Problems with snow removal and some very tough parking stalls. -no through access to the back lot. You have to back out of the parking lot??
- Before trying to determine what the best configuration would be, other changes need to be decided.
- Agree.
- No 3-6 AM eliminates use by downtown residential residents.
- I think more of that lot should be 24 hour
- Again, there should be no spots leased for the City of Platteville to make more money on poor college students.
- Yes, good Idea and support.

Proposed Change 4: Convert Rountree Avenue, Bayley Avenue, and South Court Street between the blocks of Pine Street and Mitchell Avenue from “48 Hour Public Parking” to “No Parking 3-6 AM.”

- This may be a possible option, and a start, however we would really like to see our block (1st block of Bayley) go back to permit parking as it was the first year or two of the permit system. It was very unfortunate that our block was taken out of the permit parking zone.
- Permit Parking for Bayley - (1st block)
- A simple solution would be for Bayley Avenue go back to permit parking. That would solve our problem. Thank you very much.
- No comment.
- Agree with Rountree Avenue. Don't agree with Bayley Avenue proposed change. Private property owners prefer permit parking along Bayley Avenue. Need parking for downtown residents!
- Why eliminate overnight parking on those three streets? Didn't the senior design students from UW-Platteville say that the one thing there wasn't enough of is overnight parking for residents? How many vehicles are parked on how many streets in the city every night? What if overnight parking could be increased by about 30 parking spaces tomorrow?
- don't agree. Doesn't help the residents that live along these streets especially Bayley Avenue and South Court Street.
- This is a good idea.

- Enhanced "No 3-6 AM" stalls will cause apartments to become empty over 3-5 years. No, keep this as is
- Displacing more cars over night, making people park further away where they cannot keep an eye on their car. This would make parking unsafe in Platteville. There is no reason to not allow people to park from 3-6. Absolutely no reason what-so-ever.
- This seems reasonable. No strong opinion here.
- This will deny downtown residents parking, or force them to pay the city for the new leased stalls.
- Why have a no parking? For snow removal? Just enforce that for winter months..or even odd days, limiting parking is wrong

Proposed Change 5: Consolidate timed parking categories to “15 Minute Public Parking” and “3 Hour Public Parking (9-5:30), No 3-6 AM.”

- Why use money on new signage when there is no problem, use the money for resurfacing the streets and lots.
- Ok
- This proposal is good in that it is about simplicity and consistency but it falls short in one regard. Changing customer parking from 2 hours to 3 hours sure made it easy for employees and residents to make inappropriate use of customer parking. That's a problem. What if customer parking could be improved and at the same time both employee and resident parking increased?
- Agree.
- This is a good idea to keep things consistent throughout downtown
- Ok
- I support this, but there should also be 24 hour spots as well
- This is smart. The only smart thing I've seen on this survey thus far. Why make it more confusing than it has to be.
- Fully Support this. Simple is good.
- Makes sense.
- What can you do in 15 min? Why is there even no 3-6 am?
- Will help ease confusing restrictions for customers.

Proposed Change 6: Convert the parking on the west side of Bonson Street from “city-business only” to “3 Hour Public Parking (9-5:30), No 3-6 AM.”

- Sounds good.
- Agree with the proposed change.
- Agree.
- Drop the 3-6 AM
- That sounds fine to me
- Lowers restrictions, I'm all for that.

- Fully Support this change.
- There's too many rules, can't you make it easier

Proposed Change 7: Convert the “4-Hour Parking” near the police station to “No Parking 3-6 AM.”

- That's fine.
- Agree with the proposed change.
- Agree.
- Drop the 3-6 AM
- This is fine
- That's fine.
- Support this change.

Proposed Change 8: Convert the block of Elm Street between Main Street and Pine Street to “3 Hour Public Parking (9-5:30), No 3-6 AM.”

- Drop zone on Main Street by the library
- No comments
- Agree
- Agree. What is the effect on private property owners on Elm Street? Do they need the overnight parking?
- Ok
- This is fine
- Fully Support

Comments on Guiding Principles

- How many downtown residential tenants need 24 hour parking, only overnight parking (e.g. 5 pm to 9 am)
- It is disappointing that fairness, simplicity, and consistency are not included in the guiding principles. If three blocks for customers and five blocks for employees, would it be five blocks (or more?) for residents? The Business District - Downtown Platteville (City Parking Regulations) is only eight small blocks by three small blocks (Water, Pine, Elm, Furnace). So, specifically, what is the BIG problem with downtown parking, what needs a BIG solution? A guiding principle states parking "should be shared to maximize use" but when reading the proposed changes... "Residents should not expect free overnight parking" but employees should expect free all-day parking? After reading the proposed changes, one can't help but wonder about the representation of the Task Force. And it is obvious that City Staff and the Common Council have added to and changed the proposals after the Task Force was done.
- 2. Three blocks is too far. If customers can't see the destination, they'll believe it's too far. 3. Their principle is unclear. Give one or two examples! 4. Does evening mean overnight? The private owner could lease out spaces for overnight. Unclear as "to the extent possible." 7. The

total need for parking (especially overnight spaces for tenants) should take preference over whether an existing lot is built to retail stands. Determine the need, design "old" lots to retail standards and invest in additional parking to meet the need. Don't wait to invest in additional parking. Plus, reconstruction of lots will add to the parking problem while the work is being done

- Upon talking to community members, if the expectation is to park three blocks to the business, they will shop at the box stores and the small shops downtown will lose business. Also, as a bank, having employees park five blocks in different directions is a security hazard and a major concern for the employees at night.
- I think there needs to be more 24 hour lots around town, when friends visit they have a lot of problems finding parking
- Over all there are some very nice things happening, but taking away overnight parking for the most part is not okay. Not for the majority of people who live on Main street that would now have to park extremely far away. That isn't fair to anyone except the few people who can afford to pay for leasing a spot.
- These are good principles. I would encourage you to add we will not charge for parking downtown, with the exception of overnight parking needs.
- You want to get money out of the primarily young residents of the downtown area. Basically if you rent then you need to pay up because you shouldn't be allowed a place to park. These days many more young people are coming to the Platteville area for school. Limiting parking and/or charging for limited spots is not going to alleviate problems with parking and traffic. The city needs to be realistic and build a parking garage in the next 5 to 10 years.
- Just build a parking ramp already
- Downtown residents seem to be often referred to just as college students – which is not completely accurate. You can't hold residents responsible for parking situations out of their control, and they need options as well. No one group is responsible for the parking problems, nor should one group be held responsible.

Other Comments/Suggestions

- Rather than eight proposed changes of the Task Force/City Staff/Common Council, perhaps only three of four changes are necessary and only one is a major change.
 - Suggestion 1: Leased parking is not parking that is "shared to maximize use". It makes parking worse. Discontinue leased parking and the downtown immediately gains about 30 parking spaces. Simple.
 - Suggestion 2: Customer parking can be improved. It should be 2 hour parking 8 am to 6 pm. It shouldn't be excessively enforced but it has to be adequately enforced. Customers needing more than two hours (a small percentage?) will be able to park in nearby all-day and overnight parking. All-day and overnight parking is being increased.
 - Suggestion 3: This one is the major change. The Oak Street lot becomes 21 spaces of 2 hour parking. The Mineral Street lot becomes 42 spaces of all-day parking. The Post Office lot becomes 51 spaces of overnight parking. This puts only one type of parking in each lot. This puts customer parking closest to main Street and resident parking farthest

away. Half of the Post Office lot has been underutilized for quite some time but now that the Senior Center has moved, it can be better utilized.

- The parking map I envision is eight blocks by three blocks (Water, Pine, Elm, Furnace) plus the two parking lots north of Furnace (18 and 8 spaces) and the parking area south of Pine (27 spaces). I envision only three colors on the map:
 - Red- 2 hour parking, for customers mostly 2 HOUR PARKING 8 AM TO 6 PM, NO PARKING 3 AM TO 6 AM
 - Green – all-day parking, for employees mostly NO PARKING 3-6 AM
 - Blue – overnight parking, for residents mostly 24 HOUR PARKING and 48 HOUR PARKING
- The red, green, and blue parking spaces should be numbered on the map and 15 minute and handicapped parking identified. And then, as time goes by and real information is gathered, determine if adjustments are necessary.
- I hope the Common Council and the community have a chance to read and consider my suggestions. I would be happy to talk to anyone and explain things in greater detail.
- Drop the parking limitation SW of Mitchell and Court to public use. The parking taken at the time of Rountree Commons is not used to its full potential and should be returned to the public. Gridley st where I have 4 - Apts is EMPTY 24-7-365!
- Monitor Main Street better so that employees and tenants are not parking on Main Street which is important to keep open for our customers on main Street. For over 150 years the downtown parking has been available in the historic district at no charge, can this be grandfathered in? Keeping our downtown friendly and nonrestrictive for our guests is important. Minimal fees will help the downtown community guests and retailers.