

REGULAR MEETING OF THE
CULVER CITY
PLANNING COMMISSION
CULVER CITY, CALIFORNIA

September 26, 2018
7:00 p.m.

Call to Order & Roll Call

Chair Ogosta called the regular meeting of the Culver City Planning Commission to order at 7:00 p.m.

Present: Ed Ogosta, Chair
Kevin Lachoff, Commissioner
Dana Sayles, Commissioner, AICP
David Voncannon, Commissioner

Absent: Andrew Reilman, Vice Chair

o0o

Pledge of Allegiance

Sol Blumenfeld, Community Development Director, led the Pledge of Allegiance.

o0o

Public Comment - Items NOT on the Agenda

Chair Ogosta invited public input.

No cards were received and no speakers came forward.

o0o

Presentations

None.

o0o

Consent Calendar

Item C-1

Approval of Draft Planning Commission Minutes for June 13, 2018

MOVED BY COMMISSIONER VONCANNON AND SECONDED COMMISSIONER LACHOFF THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION APPROVE THE DRAFT PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES FOR JUNE 13, 2018.

THE MOTION CARRIED BY THE FOLLOWING VOTE:

AYES: LACHOFF, SAYLES, VONCANNON
NOES: NONE
ABSENT: REILMAN
ABSTAIN: OGOSTA

oOo

Order of the Agenda

No changes were made.

oOo

Public Hearings

Item PH-1

PC: Consideration of a Zoning Code Text Amendment, P2018-0186-ZCA, Amending the Zoning Code as it Relates to the Standards and Requirements for Electric Vehicle Parking, Compact Parking, and Relaxed Parking Requirements Approved by Council Resolution in Culver City Municipal Code (CCMC) Chapter 17.320 - Off-Street Parking and Loading

Gabriela Silva, Associate Planner, provided a summary of the material of record.

Michael Allen, Planning Manager, indicated that bicycle parking had been noticed and included, and he noted that staff was waiting on the master plan and for the work of the Public Works Department on the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee to mature further before taking a zone text amendment to the Commission and City Council so the text amendment could align with the study.

Discussion ensued between staff and Commissioners regarding Commission purview; whether bicycle provisions offset car provisions; addressing individual requirements as they arise; examination of parking requirements as part of the General Plan Update; flexibility of required parking; establishing a fixed standard on EV parking; feedback on the bicycle parking item; the need for additional study regarding substituting one for the other; and standardizing compact parking sizes.

MOVED BY COMMISSIONER SAYLES AND SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER VONCANNON THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION OPEN THE PUBLIC HEARING.

THE MOTION CARRIED BY THE FOLLOWING VOTE:

AYES: OGOSTA, LACHOFF, SAYLES, VONCANNON
NOES: NONE
ABSENT: REILMAN

Chair Ogosta invited public comment.

No cards were received and no speakers came forward.

MOVED BY COMMISSIONER VONCANNON AND SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER SAYLES THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION CLOSE THE PUBLIC HEARING.

THE MOTION CARRIED BY THE FOLLOWING VOTE:

AYES: OGOSTA, LACHOFF, SAYLES, VONCANNON
NOES: NONE
ABSENT: REILMAN

Discussion ensued between staff and Commissioners regarding EV charging requirements for residential developments of four or more units; clarification on the definition of multi-family units; clarification regarding striping and parking space size; the Transit Oriented Development (TOD) resolution; clarification on the process; Planning Commission review; City Council authority; in lieu fee parking approval; limited approval of compact parking; parking deficient areas; concern with applying a condition City-wide before observing the result in the TOD; example of Brick and the Machine relative to alternative parking; addressing different objectives; concern with losing the opportunity for in lieu fees; the need for a parking analysis due to different transit options now available; concern with blanket City

Council authority; the importance of considering the impact and objectives; providing certainty for developments to have parking reductions; satisfying demand and providing alternative transit; recognition of transit priority; concern with penalizing developers; whether expectations are too onerous; EV ready spaces vs. fully EV equipped; costs for full implementation; market demand; allowing EV spaces to be available for those not charging their cars; clarification regarding multi-family residential parking requirements; ensuring adequate power supply; unintended consequences; subsidies for electric cars; tandem parking spaces; CalGreen Standards; tiering standards; addressing smaller projects; concern that one space per unit is too high; specifying one space per unit up to a certain number of units; requirements of other cities; townhouses; costs borne by owners; common vs. individual garages; guest spaces; defining the required number of spaces by the type of development; requiring EV ready spaces but not fully installed EV in a private garage regardless of the number of units; where to require the installation of actual spaces; satisfying the intent to require more spaces in a large development; unbundled parking; regulating a percentage of cars vs. the number of spaces per unit; agreement to require 20% EV ready, including 10% fully EV installed applied to common parking garages as opposed to private; EV charging for automated parking; clarification that gates for individual units in common parking garages is considered private parking; requiring one ready and one installed guest space for residential developments with under 10 guest spaces; multi-family guest spaces with condo ownership; separating out guest parking requirements; requiring one ready space for every 5 spaces and one ready and one installed per ten spaces; clarification that any project should have one ready guest space; who bears the cost of making the space operational when it is needed; incentives for the owner to install the system; requiring that the first space is fully installed; and staff agreement to return with additional information and projections.

Additional discussion ensued between staff and Commissioners regarding in lieu fees; combining language regarding reduced parking; concern with penalizing developers for doing creative things; the intent to pay for peripheral parking to satisfy mobility concerns; allocation of the fee to parking facilities or other mobility measures; the option to pay the fee or adopt mobility measures in the project; reducing parking requirements through the use of an in lieu fee to be paid by the applicant towards parking facilities or through

the implementation of mobility measures within the project; either requiring a mobility fee or requiring that the developer provide the improvement; achieving clarity and fairness in determining what the credits are; ambiguity with Brick and the Machine that is challenging for the applicant; creating a table or a menu of options; retaining a qualified consultant to help understand the equivalency between bike parking and automobile parking; the lack of cut and dried equivalency; ITE rates; capture rates; concern with leaving decisions to the whim of the City Council; applicant discretion; efforts to provide clarity, additional discretion and flexibility; the mixed-use community benefit; shared parking, proximity to transit and mobility options as part of the project approval ensuring that there is no negative impact to the surrounding neighborhood; proximity to transit; the Bristol Parkway project parking and transit options; providing more definition than the TOD provision; ensuring that things are not left too open ended; the mixed-use ordinance; automatic implementation of state reductions; things that are not within the City's jurisdiction to deny; state mandated transit reductions; allowing the Commission time to reflect on wording and make a determination after other draft revisions are made; concern with unused EV spaces; concern with affecting parking ratios; burden of proof as to whether the spaces are used or not; enforcement; management of spaces by the property owner; commercial vs. residential; signage; purview of the property owner; the practice of some cities to impose minimum costs for parking to change parking behaviors; regulation of EV station usage; EV parking as an amenity; determining required parking ratios for different uses; and delivery and expectant mother parking.

Further discussion ensued between staff and Commissioners regarding compact parking spaces; disallowing over parked spaces as compact spaces; requiring that compact parking be no more than 20% of the gross no matter what is provided; concern with forcing an entitlement; questioning basic assumptions about land use; clarification that if a comprehensive plan is done, there is relief available from the requirement; compact parking space dimensions; maneuvering space; changing dimensions of cars; door design; body flares; whether marking compact spaces is required; enforcement; vehicle code prohibition of occupying two parking spaces; commercial vs. residential; residential standards; design perspectives; tandem requirements;

administrative modifications; and the maximum reduction allowed.

MOVED BY COMMISSIONER VONCANNON AND SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER LACHOFF THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION CONTINUE THE ITEM TO OCTOBER 24, 2018. THE MOTION CARRIED BY THE FOLLOWING VOTE:

AYES: OGOSTA, LACHOFF, SAYLES, VONCANNON
NOES: NONE
ABSENT: REILMAN

o0o

Action Items

None.

o0o

Public Comment for Items Not on the Agenda

None.

o0o

Receipt of Correspondence

None.

o0o

Items from Planning Commissioners/Staff

Michael Allen, Planning Manager, indicated that two text amendments would come before the Commission at the October 24 meeting and he reported distributing a survey of dates for the Planning Commission tour of Culver City projects.

Sol Blumenfeld, Community Development Director, discussed coordination of the Hillside Text Amendment with a grading ordinance.

Discussion ensued between staff and Commissioners regarding sites to visit on the tour and encouragement to Commissioners to respond with input on dates and locations.

o0o

Adjournment

There being no further business, at 9:08 p.m., the Culver City Planning Commission adjourned to the next regular meeting on Wednesday, October 24, 2018, at 7:00 p.m.

o0o

SUSAN HERBERTSON
SENIOR PLANNER of the CULVER CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

APPROVED _____

ED OGOSTA
CHAIR of the CULVER CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
Culver City, California

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that, on the date below written, these minutes were filed in the Office of the City Clerk, Culver City, California and constitute the Official Minutes of said meeting.

Jeremy Green
CITY CLERK

Date