

Letters to the Editor

 culvercitynews.org/letters-to-the-editor-17

Lucille Cooper

December 12, 2014

Re: Preservation of Farragut's Permit-Only-Parking Restrictions

Dear Editor:

This letter responds to the latest missives from Michael Gotz (Gotz) and Richard P. Schoenbaum, D.D.S. (DDS).

Gotz

Gotz's basic problem is that he mistakenly assumes the existence or truth of various alleged facts.

He wants to "try to find a resolution of the issue of parking on [our] block of Farragut." But that issue has been resolved by various City Councils for 32 years and recently by the Traffic Engineer.

He mentions "the Grace Church parking situation"? But what is the alleged "situation"? Other than some unsubstantiated, vague statements from Ken Smith, no one— not one person—has stated that they were impeded from participating in a Church activity due to the Farragut Parking Restrictions. Gotz states,

“Church people would have a place to park their cars on a very short, temporary basis.” The Meals-on-Wheels and handicapped folks have parking permits. All others have nearby available parking—but not on Farragut.

Gotz suggests that Farragut residents accept the Church’s proposal of 2-hour-parking restrictions, as a compromise. That is non-starter. Gotz states, without any factual support, “The City STRICTLY ENFORCES the 2-hour limit.” Everyone, but Gotz, knows that that is impossible. The urban myth of two-hour-parking restrictions was invented by the commercial community to avoid having to provide customer parking. Culver City’s response to my recent Public Records Act request stated, in effect, that the City has never determined the effectiveness and/ or enforceability of 2-hour-parking restrictions.

Gotz mistakenly assumes that only the Church covets parking on Farragut. He forgets the parking desires of parents and teachers at the nearby schools, customers of nearby businesses and the thousands of nearby apartment dwellers. He cannot envision the land-rush that he considers a “compromise.”

Gotz is correct that we “are good people who do not purposely put [ourselves] in conflict with others for no good reason.” Again, other than Ken Smith and his political protégé—Andrew Weissman—who does he imply are these “others”?

Finally, Gotz states, “Can you live with this?” I assume that “this” means giving into to Ken Smith’s cravings. The short answer is, “No.” The status quo is just fine. Additional parking restrictions on Saturdays and Sundays would be better.

DDS

DDS considers Ken Smith’s unsubstantiated request that Farragut, in effect, abandon all parking protection and the City Council’s apparent willingness to trample our legal rights as just “a modest change.” DDS is touching a nerve, but his arguments are toothless.

He asks, “Why can’t the people residing on Farragut be good neighbors?” We are good neighbors. We did not start this latest eruption of Ken Smith’s manifest destiny. Currently, the Church has unrestricted Farragut parking on Saturdays and Sundays, which accommodates the Church and the three other churches to which it rents. Ken Smith proudly admitted that church-goers cause every space on Farragut to be occupied from 8 AM to 2 PM on Sundays. Farragut residents have tolerated that continuing-public nuisance for too many years.

When we assert our position, DDS calls it “run[ning] off at the mouth about [our] delusional image of what constitutes neighborly behavior.” Wow, that language is a mouth full!

DDS knows much about running off at the mouth. In 1997, DDS told us to move from Culver City if we did not like what the Church was then doing. Further, DDS states, “I have seen first hand your disdain for the church and its work.” Oh, really? He states that we encouraged Franklin residents to assert their parking

rights— rights provided to them by Culver City. That's not "disdain for the church." Additionally, DDS states, "I have seen and heard your badgering and inflammatory rhetoric and the damage it can do." Who is he talking about? What alleged rhetoric? What alleged damage?

DDS has not filled us with any fact bracing his tartar-covered allegations, as no such fact exists. The Tooth Fairy has more credibility.

Les Greenberg
