



# City of Culver City

Mike Balkman  
Council Chambers  
9770 Culver Blvd.  
Culver City, CA 90232  
(310) 253-5851

## Staff Report

---

File #: 21-1003, Version: 1

Item #: A-6

---

**CC - (1) Discussion and Consideration of a Support Position for AB 1401 (Friedman) - Residential and Commercial Development: Parking Requirements; and (2) Direction to the City Manager as Deemed Appropriate.**

**Meeting Date:** May 24, 2021

**Contact Person/Dept:** Shelly Wolfberg/City Manager's Office  
**Phone Number:** (310) 253-6000

**Fiscal Impact:** Yes  No

**General Fund:** Yes  No

**Public Hearing:**  **Action Item:**  **Attachments:**

**Commission Action Required:** Yes  No  **Date:**

**Public Notification:** (E-Mail) Assemblymember Laura Friedman's Office and Meetings and Agendas - City Council (05/20/2021).

**Department Approval:** John M. Nachbar (05/19/2021)

---

### RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends the City Council (1) discuss and consider a support position for AB 1401 for residential and commercial development: parking requirements; and (2) provide direction to the City Manager as deemed appropriate.

### BACKGROUND

At the May 10, 2021 City Council Meeting, Mayor Fisch received consensus to agendize a City Council item to consider supporting AB 1401 (Friedman) (Attachment 1) to be brought back for approval at a future City Council meeting. Assemblymember Friedman's staff has provided the Author's Fact Sheet. (Attachment 2)

### **About AB 1401**

#### *Current Law*

The Planning and Zoning Law requires each county and city to adopt a comprehensive, long-term

general plan for its physical development, and the development of certain lands outside its boundaries, that includes, among other mandatory elements, a land use element, and a conservation element. Existing law also permits variances to be granted from the parking requirements of a zoning ordinance for nonresidential development if the variance will be an incentive to the development and the variance will facilitate access to the development by patrons of public transit facilities.

*AB 1401 - Amends the Law*

SECTION 1. Section 65863.3 is added to the Government Code, to read:

65863.3. (a) A local government shall not impose a minimum automobile parking requirement, or enforce a minimum automobile parking requirement, on residential, commercial, or other development if the parcel is located within one-half mile walking distance of public transit.

(b) When a project provides parking voluntarily, nothing in this section shall preclude a local government from imposing requirements on that voluntary parking to require spaces for car share vehicles.

(c) Subdivision (a) shall not reduce, eliminate, or preclude the enforcement of any requirement imposed on a new multifamily residential or nonresidential development to provide electric vehicle parking spaces or parking spaces that are accessible to persons with disabilities that would have otherwise applied to the development if this section did not apply.

(d) For purposes of this section, "public transit" means either of the following:

- (1) A high-quality transit corridor as defined in subdivision (b) of Section 21155 of the Public Resources Code. (Attachment 3)
- (2) A major transit stop as defined in Section 21064.3 of the Public Resources Code. (Attachment 4)

(e) The Legislature finds and declares that this section addresses a matter of statewide concern rather than a municipal affair as that term is used in Section 5 of Article XI of the California Constitution. Therefore, this section applies to all cities, including charter cities.

SEC. 2. No reimbursement is required by this act pursuant to Section 6 of Article XIII B of the California Constitution because a local agency or school district has the authority to levy service charges, fees, or assessments sufficient to pay for the program or level of service mandated by this act, within the meaning of Section 17556 of the Government Code.

As of April 27, 2021, several entities have taken positions on AB 1409, based on the bill's text dated April 19, 2021.

## **DISCUSSION**

The City Council is requested to discuss and consider whether it wants to support AB 1401 as it is currently written. The City's Legislative and Policy Platform (LPP) does not provide clear direction to

either support or oppose what is recommended in AB 1401. However, among other positions in the LPP, the LPP supports efforts to (1) protect and/or expand the City's authority and rights over its affairs; and (2) adopt reasonable environmental regulations aimed at enhancing air and water quality.

Staff requires City Council direction in order to take a position on AB 1401. If the City Council takes a position on this bill, staff will transmit the position letter to the bill's author and appropriate committee members. Staff will monitor any future amendments to AB 1401 to determine whether they are consistent with the City Council's direction to continue to submit position letters.

### **FISCAL ANALYSIS**

Discussion and direction regarding this matter does not create a fiscal impact to the City.

### **ATTACHMENTS**

1. 2021-05-24\_\_ATT\_\_AB 1401 (Friedman) Legislation
2. 2021-05-24\_\_ATT\_\_AB 1401 (Friedman) Fact Sheet
3. 2021-05-24\_\_ATT\_\_ Public Resources Code, Section 21155
4. 2021-05-24\_\_ATT\_\_ Public Resources Code, Section 21064.3

### **MOTION**

That the City Council:

1. Discuss and consider a support position for AB 1401; and
2. Provide direction to the City Manager as deemed appropriate.

AMENDED IN ASSEMBLY APRIL 19, 2021

AMENDED IN ASSEMBLY APRIL 5, 2021

CALIFORNIA LEGISLATURE—2021–22 REGULAR SESSION

**ASSEMBLY BILL**

**No. 1401**

---

---

**Introduced by Assembly Member Friedman**  
**(Coauthor: Assembly Member Lee)**  
(Coauthors: Senators Skinner and Wiener)

February 19, 2021

---

---

An act to add Section 65863.3 to the Government Code, relating to land use.

LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL'S DIGEST

AB 1401, as amended, Friedman. Residential and commercial development: parking requirements.

The Planning and Zoning Law requires each county and city to adopt a comprehensive, long-term general plan for its physical development, and the development of certain lands outside its boundaries, that includes, among other mandatory elements, a land use element and a conservation element. Existing law also permits variances to be granted from the parking requirements of a zoning ordinance for nonresidential development if the variance will be an incentive to the development and the variance will facilitate access to the development by patrons of public transit facilities.

This bill would prohibit a local government from imposing a minimum automobile parking requirement, or enforcing a minimum automobile parking requirement, on residential, commercial, or other development if the development is located on a parcel that is within one-half mile walking distance of public transit, as defined. The bill would not

preclude a local government from imposing requirements when a project provides parking voluntarily to require spaces for car share vehicles. *The bill would prohibit these provisions from reducing, eliminating, or precluding the enforcement of any requirement imposed on a new multifamily or nonresidential development to provide electric vehicle parking spaces or parking spaces that are accessible to persons with disabilities, as specified.*

By changing the duties of local planning officials, this bill would impose a state-mandated local program.

The bill would include findings that changes proposed by this bill address a matter of statewide concern rather than a municipal affair and, therefore, apply to all cities, including charter cities.

The California Constitution requires the state to reimburse local agencies and school districts for certain costs mandated by the state. Statutory provisions establish procedures for making that reimbursement.

This bill would provide that no reimbursement is required by this act for a specified reason.

Vote: majority. Appropriation: no. Fiscal committee: yes.  
State-mandated local program: yes.

*The people of the State of California do enact as follows:*

- 1 SECTION 1. Section 65863.3 is added to the Government
- 2 Code, to read:
- 3 65863.3. (a) A local government shall not impose a minimum
- 4 automobile parking requirement, or enforce a minimum automobile
- 5 parking requirement, on residential, commercial, or other
- 6 development if the parcel is located within one-half mile walking
- 7 distance of public transit.
- 8 (b) When a project provides parking voluntarily, nothing in this
- 9 section shall preclude a local government from imposing
- 10 requirements on that voluntary parking to require spaces for car
- 11 share vehicles.
- 12 (c) *Subdivision (a) shall not reduce, eliminate, or preclude the*
- 13 *enforcement of any requirement imposed on a new multifamily*
- 14 *residential or nonresidential development to provide electric*
- 15 *vehicle parking spaces or parking spaces that are accessible to*
- 16 *persons with disabilities that would have otherwise applied to the*
- 17 *development if this section did not apply.*
- 18 (e)

1 (d) For purposes of this section, “public transit” means either  
2 of the following:

3 (1) A high-quality transit corridor as defined in subdivision (b)  
4 of Section 21155 of the Public Resources Code.

5 (2) A major transit stop as defined in Section 21064.3 of the  
6 Public Resources Code.

7 ~~(d)~~

8 (e) The Legislature finds and declares that this section addresses  
9 a matter of statewide concern rather than a municipal affair as that  
10 term is used in Section 5 of Article XI of the California  
11 Constitution. Therefore, this section applies to all cities, including  
12 charter cities.

13 SEC. 2. No reimbursement is required by this act pursuant to  
14 Section 6 of Article XIII B of the California Constitution because  
15 a local agency or school district has the authority to levy service  
16 charges, fees, or assessments sufficient to pay for the program or  
17 level of service mandated by this act, within the meaning of Section  
18 17556 of the Government Code.

O



## AB 1401 – Parking Requirements Reform

### Summary:

AB 1401 would prohibit a local government from imposing or enforcing a minimum parking requirement on developments located near public transit. This measure would reduce car dependence, lower carbon emissions, and encourage more housing production near transit.

### Background:

Many cities in California require new residential or commercial development to provide on-site parking spaces. Often, apartments must include one or two parking spots per unit, and commercial properties must provide one space for every 100-200 square feet (frequently causing more space to be provided for parking than for the business itself). These one-size-fits-all mandates are often imposed even in areas that are close to transit.

Mandatory parking requirements have led to an oversupply of parking spaces; Los Angeles County alone has 18.6 million parking spaces, or almost two for every resident. Experts believe that this policy encourages car dependence and discourages mass transit usage, increasing vehicle miles traveled. California needs to reduce vehicle miles traveled by 15% in order to meet its SB 32 climate goals, even in a scenario with full vehicle electrification.

Mandatory parking requirements also worsen California's severe housing shortage by raising the cost of housing production. On average, a garage costs \$24,000-\$34,000 per space to build, a cost that is passed on to households regardless of whether they own a car. Additionally, on-site parking takes up space that could otherwise be used for additional apartment units.

In recent years, California has instituted some incremental reforms to parking mandates. AB 744 (2015) limits local parking requirements to 0.5 spaces per bedroom for housing near transit that uses the state density bonus program or is 100% affordable to lower-income households. Projects that are streamlined under SB 35 (2017) are exempt from parking requirements if

the project is near transit or within a historic district, and may not be required to provide more than one space per housing unit in all other areas. Additionally, San Diego and Oakland have eliminated parking minimums near transit, while San Francisco has eliminated them citywide.

However, these harmful parking mandates remain in place in most cities, requiring bolder action to address California's climate, transportation, and housing challenges. AB 1401 does not prohibit property owners from building on-site parking. Rather, it would give them the flexibility to decide on their own how much on-site parking to provide, instead of requiring them to comply with a one-size-fits-all mandate.

### AB 1401 (as amended on April 19, 2021):

- Prohibits a local government from imposing or enforcing a minimum parking requirement on residential, commercial, or other development if the project is within one-half mile walking distance of public transit (either a major transit stop or a location along a high-quality transit corridor); and
- Requires new multifamily or nonresidential projects to continue to provide electric vehicle parking spaces and parking spaces that are accessible to persons with disabilities.

### Support:

California YIMBY (co-sponsor)  
San Francisco Bay Area Planning and Urban Research Association (SPUR) (co-sponsor)  
Abundant Housing LA (co-sponsor)  
Council of Infill Builders (co-sponsor)

### Contact:

Jim Metropulos  
Office of Assemblymember Laura Friedman  
916.319.2043  
jim.metropulos@asm.ca.gov

**State of California**

**PUBLIC RESOURCES CODE**

**Section 21155**

---

21155. (a) This chapter applies only to a transit priority project that is consistent with the general use designation, density, building intensity, and applicable policies specified for the project area in either a sustainable communities strategy or an alternative planning strategy, for which the State Air Resources Board, pursuant to subparagraph (H) of paragraph (2) of subdivision (b) of Section 65080 of the Government Code, has accepted a metropolitan planning organization's determination that the sustainable communities strategy or the alternative planning strategy would, if implemented, achieve the greenhouse gas emission reduction targets.

(b) For purposes of this chapter, a transit priority project shall (1) contain at least 50 percent residential use, based on total building square footage and, if the project contains between 26 percent and 50 percent nonresidential uses, a floor area ratio of not less than 0.75; (2) provide a minimum net density of at least 20 dwelling units per acre; and (3) be within one-half mile of a major transit stop or high-quality transit corridor included in a regional transportation plan. A major transit stop is as defined in Section 21064.3, except that, for purposes of this section, it also includes major transit stops that are included in the applicable regional transportation plan. For purposes of this section, a high-quality transit corridor means a corridor with fixed route bus service with service intervals no longer than 15 minutes during peak commute hours. A project shall be considered to be within one-half mile of a major transit stop or high-quality transit corridor if all parcels within the project have no more than 25 percent of their area farther than one-half mile from the stop or corridor and if not more than 10 percent of the residential units or 100 units, whichever is less, in the project are farther than one-half mile from the stop or corridor.

(Added by Stats. 2008, Ch. 728, Sec. 14. Effective January 1, 2009.)



**State of California**

**PUBLIC RESOURCES CODE**

**Section 21064.3**

---

21064.3. “Major transit stop” means a site containing any of the following:

- (a) An existing rail or bus rapid transit station.
- (b) A ferry terminal served by either a bus or rail transit service.
- (c) The intersection of two or more major bus routes with a frequency of service interval of 15 minutes or less during the morning and afternoon peak commute periods.

(Amended by Stats. 2019, Ch. 631, Sec. 2. (AB 1560) Effective January 1, 2020.)



# CITY OF CULVER CITY

9770 CULVER BOULEVARD  
CULVER CITY, CALIFORNIA 90232-0507  
CITY HALL Tel. (310) 253-6000  
FAX (310) 253-6010

ALEX FISCH  
MAYOR

DANIEL LEE  
VICE MAYOR

COUNCIL MEMBERS  
GÖRAN ERIKSSON  
YASMINE-IMANI MCMORRIN  
ALBERT VERA

May 26, 2021

The Honorable Laura Friedman  
California State Assembly  
State Capitol  
Sacramento CA 95814

## **Support for AB 1401 Residential and commercial development: parking requirements.**

Dear Chair Friedman:

On behalf of the City of Culver City, I write to express our strong support for your Assembly Bill 1401 to eliminate local minimum parking requirements for both residential and commercial buildings.

Culver City is a five-square-mile, urban community of 39,000 residents surrounded by the City of Los Angeles. Developers have recently built numerous large mixed-use, commercial, and residential developments here, and many more are under construction. The area surrounding our Metro Expo Line transit hub is rapidly growing into a thriving urban destination for working, living, shopping, and dining. Major corporations such as Apple and Amazon quickly absorb new commercial real estate space here and new residential units here are rapidly leased. New developments here have been required to include a significant number of parking spaces, even though they may be adjacent to high-quality rail and bus lines or within walking or biking distance of job centers.

As Culver City completes our General Plan Update, which will be the vision and guiding principles for our future, we see the opportunity of AB 1401. By reducing the over-building of parking, AB 1401 would reduce traffic, greenhouse gas emissions and air pollution, reduce the cost of housing to renters and homeowners, and improve the prospects of small neighborhood businesses who have fought to survive during the pandemic.

On-site parking reduces the housing supply by taking up space that could otherwise be used for additional apartments. Providing on-site parking is also very expensive, costing \$30,000 to \$75,000 per space to build. This cost is passed on to renters and home buyers, regardless of whether they own a car. In fact, a recent study by Santa Clara University, researchers found that the cost of garage parking to renter households is approximately \$1,700 per year, or an additional 17% of a housing unit's rent.<sup>1</sup>

In response to the pandemic and the closure of restaurants and small shops, local governments including the City of Culver City have allowed businesses to expand into on-site and street parking spaces to allow for safe outdoor dining and shopping. These new and more productive

---

<sup>1</sup> Gabbe, C. J., & Pierce, G. (2017). Hidden Costs and Deadweight Losses: Bundled Parking and Residential Rents in the Metropolitan United States. *Housing Policy Debate*, 27(2), 217–229.

Friedman  
May 26, 2021  
Page 2

uses of parking spaces have shown us the way forward to create more inviting and sustainable neighborhoods and allow small businesses to survive and in some cases thrive. This bill would remove arbitrary restrictions that prevent small businesses from using their property for its most productive use.

AB 1401 will prevent the wasteful overproduction of parking spaces and reduce car dependency and carbon emissions. It will also encourage greater transit usage and more housing and business growth near transit, helping to create revitalized and pedestrian-friendly commercial corridors and downtowns throughout California.

This bill does not prohibit property owners from building on-site parking. Rather, it gives them the flexibility to decide on their own how much on-site parking to provide, instead of requiring compliance with a one-size-fits-all mandate.

Thank you for your leadership in addressing climate change and promoting sustainable transportation, affordable housing and livable communities with this important legislation.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Alex Fisch". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Alex Fisch  
Mayor

cc: The Honorable Sydney Kamlager, Member of the State Senate  
The Honorable Isaac Bryan  
The Honorable Members of the City Council  
John M. Nachbar, City Manager