



# City of Culver City

Mike Balkman Council  
Chambers  
9770 Culver Blvd.  
Culver City, CA 90232

## Staff Report

---

**File #:** 19-920, **Version:** 1

**Item #:** PH-1.

---

**CC - (1) Direction Regarding Parking Code Amendment Strategies; and (2) PUBLIC HEARING: Introduction of an Ordinance Amending Title 17, Zoning, of the Culver City Municipal Code (CCMC), Chapter 17.320 - Off-Street Parking and Loading, as it Relates to the Standards and Requirements for Electric Vehicle Parking, Compact Parking, and Reduced Parking (Zoning Code Text Amendment, P2018-0186-ZCA).**

**Meeting Date:** May 13, 2019

**Contact Person/Dept:** Gabriela Silva/Current Planning  
Michael Allen/Current Planning  
Sol Blumenfeld/Community Development

**Phone Number:** (310) 253-5710  
(310) 253-5700

**Fiscal Impact:** Yes ☐ No ☒

**General Fund:** Yes ☐ No ☒

**Public Hearing:** ☒ **Action Item:** ☐ **Attachments:** ☒

**Commission Action Required:** Yes ☒ No ☐ **Date:** September 26, 2018

**Public Notification:** (Email) Master Notification List (01/24/19, 04/25/19); (Posted) City website (01/24/19, 04/25/19); (Published) in Culver City News (01/10/19, 04/25/19); Meetings and Agendas - City Council (05/08/19)

**Department Approval:** Sol Blumenfeld, Community Development Director (05/02/19)

---

### **RECOMMENDATION**

Staff recommends the City Council (1) provide direction to staff regarding desired future parking strategies; and (2) introduce an Ordinance (Attachment No. 1) approving Zoning Code Text Amendment P2018-0186-ZCA, amending Zoning Code Chapter 17.320 - Off-Street Parking and Loading, to allow changes pertaining to the standards and requirements for EV parking, compact parking, and reduced parking

### **PROCEDURES**

1. The Mayor seeks a motion to receive and file the affidavit of publication and posting of the

public hearing notice.

2. The Mayor calls on staff for a brief staff report and City Council poses questions to staff as desired.
3. The Mayor seeks a motion to declare the public hearing open and the City Council receives public comment.
4. The Mayor seeks a motion to close the public hearing after all testimony has been presented
5. The City Council discusses the matter and arrives at its decision

## **BACKGROUND**

On September 26, 2018, the Planning Commission recommended approval of the subject text amendments, which include changes to create requirements for electric vehicle (EV) charging, expanding compact parking allowances Citywide, and also expanding reduced parking provisions Citywide rather than just as part of mixed-use development in the transit oriented development (TOD) district. On February 11, 2019, the City Council considered the Planning Commission's recommendation and directed staff to provide more context regarding the purpose of the text amendments relative to the goals of mobility and sustainability. In addition, the Council requested that staff look into other cities' experience with the shorter compact parking space lengths, and that staff look into increasing the proposed amount of required EV parking, whether distinguishing the level of charger requirements by use would be appropriate, as well as providing information about costs associated with providing EV in housing developments.

## **DISCUSSION**

There are a myriad of changes occurring in cities now related to mobility and sustainability. The proposed parking text amendments are intended as an initial step in addressing such changes as the City transitions toward new modes of mobility, livability and more sustainable development.

In order to provide a contextual understanding of the proposed parking measures, staff organized them by category and arranged them in a summary matrix. The summary matrix (Attachment No. 6) compares proposed new parking strategies with the broader goals of mobility, sustainability and livability.

The parking strategies fall into five broad categories:

- 1.) EV/Alternative Fuel
- 2.) Mobility
- 3.) Reduced Parking Footprint and Count
- 4.) Pricing
- 5.) Consolidated Parking

Each of the proposed code amendments achieve different, but related goals, like reducing reliance

upon fossil fuels, or shrinking the amount of land dedicated to parking or locating parking where it can best relieve congestion and enhance local mobility. The goals are different in that they produce specific outcomes, but related because together they provide ways to move the city more efficiently and achieve best practices to elevate urban life. For example, locating parking remotely provides an avenue for removing cars from urban areas and creating auto-free, pedestrian zones, allowing more room for alternative transit and a clear path for biking and pedestrians. The land dedicated to new use may become a cycle track, a bus only lane, micro-transit route or part of a new open space network of retail, restaurant, outdoor dining and pocket parks. The emphasis on land use dedicated to people instead of cars makes public spaces safer for pedestrians and helps achieve Vision Zero goals.

In a like manner, unbundling and sharing parking provides a way to reconsider both land use and parking to the benefit of both. Many parking garages are heavily used in the day during peak periods and go largely unused for the remainder of the day and evening. Rather than using parking assets in this manner, it is more efficient to share it as a resource among surrounding land uses, which could include commercial and residential neighborhoods. This solution helps avoid wasteful overbuilding of garages and helps reduce construction costs. The funds saved can be put back into the project to achieve important urban goals such as creating great urban spaces that promote urban design goals. Similarly, collecting in lieu parking proceeds for pedestrian, landscape and streetscape improvements elevates urbanism and enhances mobility by making streets more walkable.

Pricing parking in the most desirable locations based upon its value can have a similar effect. When the true value of the parking is established in areas, people refrain from using it due to cost. The indirect effect is to drive parking into remote locations where it can be absorbed, preferably not in residential neighborhoods but in remote parking districts, freeing up the land for more attractive alternative land uses.

The following summarizes the parking strategies currently proposed and those recommended for future consideration.

#### EV/Alternative Fuel

- Mandatory 50% of Required Parking EV Ready, 50% of the EV Ready Must be EV Charging with Potential Use as Conventional Parking as Demand Warrants and Subject to Parking Audit.
- Mandatory Level 2 Charging and Parking Reductions
- Large MXD Parking Reductions with 50% Alternative Fuel/Hybrid Vehicle Parking

#### Mobility

- Car Share On-Site or at Curb Loading for Parking Reductions
- Ride Share On-Site or at Curb Loading for Parking Reductions
- Mandatory Above Ground Parking Structures Designed for Convertibility
- In Lieu Parking Funds Applied at Peripheral Parking Sites
- Parking Unbundled

- Employee Mobility Rewards Cash Out for Not Driving and Not Parking On Site
- Substitute Mobility Options for Required On Site Parking Spaces
- Congestion Management Tied to Parking Supply (Reduced On Site in Designated Areas)
- Vision Zero Goals Tied to Reduced Parking Ratios in Entitlements

#### Reduced Parking Footprint/Reduced Parking Count

- Reduce Required Parking for All Work Related Land Uses
- Reduce Parking Stall Sizes and Drive Aisles
- Set Maximum Parking Requirements
- Car Stackers/Automated Parking Citywide Through Administrative Process or By Right
- Shared Parking and MXD Density Bonus
- Reduced Parking for MXD Affordable Housing Projects

#### Consolidated Parking

- Shared Parking with Surrounding Commercial Community
- Shared Parking for all MXD Entitlements

#### Pricing

- Implement Public Parking Pricing Strategies by District
- In Lieu Parking Contributions to Fund Traffic Calming Streetscape, Landscape & Crosswalk Improvements
- Mobility Fund Surcharge to Provide More Than Code Required Parking

### SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

#### EV and Alternative Fuel Vehicles

Gas driven automobiles are a major contributor of global greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. Efforts to control GHG are highly dependent on the extent to which cities can promote use of non-fossil fuel vehicles and encourage new development that facilitates alternative fuel vehicle use. When EV charging stations and alternative fuel or clean air vehicle parking are part of new project code required parking, particularly with respect to stall location and parking count, it helps promote policies directed a GHG reduction.

Multifamily housing makes up 47.8 percent of the housing in the City.<sup>1</sup> Most residents of multifamily dwellings in Culver City do not have access to home EV charging units for plug-in electric vehicles. In order to promote the use of electric vehicles going forward, EV charging can be made a more

significant proportion of required parking in new multifamily developments.<sup>2</sup>

The proposed EV parking recommendations would require 50% of the required project parking to be EV ready and 50% of the EV ready stalls to be EV Charging stalls (ready to use). This requirement does not appear to be addressed in current studies.<sup>2</sup> The proposed high complement of EV parking may be oversupplied in the near term and represents a significant development expense but the cost could be offset by allowing the spaces to be used as regular parking stalls until such time that EV demand increased and the spaces had to be dedicated to EV use. The project parking EV supply and demand can be checked with an annual report as part of project conditions of approval.

#### Mobility - Density Incentives, Transportation Demand Management (TDM), Shared/Unbundled Parking, Ride/Car Share, Employee Incentives

Mandatory measures to reduce parking requirements for work related lands uses tend to discourage automobile commute trips. These measures can be code requirements or TDM conditions of new development. The measures can be tied to new mixed use development density incentives, maximizing the mix of uses around public transit so that new development is conveniently located near transit and helps alleviate traffic congestion.

Shared parking facilities make parking spaces publically accessible and available on a first come first served basis rather than reserved for a particular tenant. Code requirements to unbundle parking and share it allow a reduction of code required parking serving separate on-site uses. Estimates are that between 20-40% of on-site parking may be made available on a shared parking basis.<sup>3</sup> Ride share and car share provides relief for first and last mile travel and promotes mobility goals and also reduces the need for on-site parking.

#### Reduced Parking Footprint/Supply and Convertible Parking Garages

Stacked parking and automated parking effectively reduces the parking footprint by up to half the size of conventional parking. Reducing stall size and back up drive aisles, including the implementation of compact parking, also reduces the land area required for parking.

When employees are incentivized to use alternative transportation from the outset, it is possible to shrink the parking footprint as part of new project design which also advances mobility goals and like all efforts to reduce land area delegated to parking, it enhances good urban design.

Above ground convertible parking garages allow eventual replacement with more attractive and financially efficient lands uses as the demand for parking diminishes. The convertible garages require flat floor plates and site planning that locate the building toward the street edge, and provide appropriate street level design and adequate screening that contributes to the pedestrian environment.

#### Pricing Strategies

Optimizing parking utilization through pricing can reduce on-site parking demand and discourage auto use in areas of congestion. Congestion pricing can also encourage use of underutilized parking assets. Pricing strategies can be combined with employee incentives to further incentivize remote parking use outside of congested areas. This requires developing a citywide public parking pricing

strategy and applying it to meeting city objectives.

Applying in-lieu parking fees to fund mobility improvements such as traffic calming, streetscape, landscape & crosswalk and other mobility improvements requires amendment of the Alternative Parking provisions for in lieu parking fees (Section 17.320.025)

Applying a Mobility Fee to projects that propose more than code required parking should discourage extra on-site parking and will require adoption of a mobility fee (currently being prepared).

### Consolidated Parking

On-site parking may be shared with a surrounding older commercial neighborhood when there is a lack of parking supply in the area. When a development provides current code required parking, the City can mandate that the off-peak parking supply must be shared within a neighboring parking district. Consolidated parking can also be used with congestion pricing to promote remote parking assets.

### Proposed Text Amendments

Staff is returning with the three parking strategies (regarding EV, compact and reduced parking) previously reviewed at the February 11, 2019 City Council meeting -- EV charging stations, compact parking, and reduced parking. All three proposed parking code text amendments achieve many of the mobility and sustainability parking strategies discussed above. Further, the City Council had asked staff to research the following questions regarding the proposed text amendments:

- Do other jurisdictions experience issues or conflicts related to standard and oversized vehicles parking in compact parking spaces?
  - Of the cities surveyed for compact parking requirements, five (5) responded to staff's inquiry regarding whether the reduced stall dimensions had presented any challenges or conflicts in terms of vehicle maneuvering/circulation and/or obstruction of multiple stalls.
  - All indicated they had no formal data regarding these potential conflicts. Two of the jurisdictions indicated there had been informal personal observation and concerns of larger vehicles using compact stalls (7.5 feet by 15 feet and 16 feet) and encroaching into aisles or abutting stalls.
  - The first jurisdiction indicated they will be working on a more comprehensive update to parking requirements and would possibly revisit compact parking standards as part of that update, specifically the percentage allowance (currently thirty (30) percent).
  - The second jurisdiction indicated they perceived this to be a real concern particularly for high turnover retail uses, that the length was more of a concern than the width, and that the percentage allowance is potentially a bit high (currently forty (40) percent).
- What are the estimated costs associated with EV implementation?
  - Per a study by the UCLA Luskin Center for Innovation, costs associated with implementing EV parking infrastructure varied widely, depending on the extent of the upgrades needed. The range provided by the study started at approximately \$900 and increased up to \$46,600.
- Should the amendment specify the charger level required (e.g. Level 1 or 2)?

- The referenced study also indicates Level 1 chargers require a standard 110/120-volt outlet and can charge four to six miles per hour, making them suitable for most residential applications where a driver can charge a vehicle for three to eight hours and achieve mileage for the average commute of fifteen to forty-five miles. Level 2 chargers can charge at a rate of eight to twenty-four miles per hour, but require a 208/240-volt outlet. This type of outlet necessitates a different receptacle than the standard three-prong, and often require a dedicated circuit because of their energy requirements.
- Review of previous research and additional sources showed that when referencing EV spaces, minimum requirements typically include providing the capacity for a dedicated 208/240 volt circuit, which is typically associated with Level 2 chargers

Based on City Council feedback and additional research and information considered, the following amendment are recommended.

### EV Parking

- Residential developments of four (4) or more units would be required to provide twenty percent (20%) of parking stalls with full EV charging stations plus twenty percent (20%) as EV ready. Guest parking would provide ten percent (10%) EV charging stations and twenty percent (20%) EV ready, with a minimum of one (1) EV ready space and then one (1) charging station for any development with less than ten (10) guest spaces. In addition, as directed by the Planning Commission, full EV chargers should not be required for multi-family residential developments where the parking for each unit is individually enclosed and privately accessed.
- Non-residential developments would be required to provide full EV charging stations for ten percent (10%) of the required vehicle parking spaces, with a minimum of one (1) space, and EV ready for twenty percent (20%) of the required vehicle parking spaces, with a minimum of two (2) spaces. A minimum of one of the total chargers required would be a Level 2 charger for developments incorporating a retail, restaurant, or other high turnover use, with an additional number of the chargers required to be Level 2, in proportion to the amount of floor area dedicated to high turnover uses within the development. Attachment No. 4 provides a few examples of how these standards would be applied to different project types, demonstrating the calculation of the required EV parking spaces.
- Alternatively, the Council could consider a higher percentage of EV parking, requiring twenty-five percent of stalls to be EV ready and an additional twenty-five percent to be equipped with EV chargers, for a total of 50% EV parking spaces.

The proposed EV standards go above and beyond the minimums identified through the survey of other surrounding jurisdictions and the Green Building Code, but not as far as previously discussed by City Council; and the amendment is consistent with the direction to maximize EV parking in order to be progressive and prepare for the future, rather than trying to catch up later.

### Compact Parking

- Expand allowances for compact parking citywide, by allowing up to twenty (20) percent of the parking provided as compact, for non-residential uses only, in areas outside of the two (2) existing parking districts.

- As currently permitted in certain City districts, compact parking spaces must measure a minimum of 7'-6" wide by 17'-6" long (including in the two (2) parking districts where compact parking is currently allowed), and must be clearly marked as compact. The proposed change would be citywide.
- Compact parking spaces will not be eligible for requests for further reductions in dimensions, such as through an Administrative Modification or other similar entitlement.

The proposed compact parking dimensions are consistent with the typical dimensions allowed in the surrounding jurisdictions surveyed. Of the jurisdictions that provided feedback on compact stall size, none had any formal data, but two indicated that there was a perception that some parking was affected, and that the allowable percentage should be revised.

### Reduced Parking

Expand provisions for requests for parking reductions citywide, rather than only for mixed-use projects in the TOD district, by allowing required parking for a project to be reduced through the use of an in-lieu fee or implementation of mobility measures, subject to City Council approval. The in-lieu fee would be applied towards the development of mobility measures, rather than just public parking facilities, as currently allowed. Approval of such parking reductions would be based on consideration of proximity to transit, mobility options, other parking configurations, and/or shared parking analysis, demonstrating a reduction will not result in negative impacts.

## ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION

The proposed Zoning Code Amendment (P2018-0186-ZCA), to amend Zoning Code Chapter 17.320 - Off-street Parking and Loading, is considered exempt pursuant to Section 15061(b)(3) of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), because it can be seen with certainty that there is no possibility that the Project will have a significant effect on the environment. The Project by itself, does not result in any physical changes in the environment because it will only amend the Zoning Code to require and allow certain types of parking as part of future development, and does not result in an intensification of development beyond what the Zoning Code already currently allows. Future projects incorporating the parking types specified by the proposed amendment will be reviewed individually pursuant to CEQA as may be applicable.

## FISCAL ANALYSIS

There is no fiscal impact associated with the adoption of the proposed ordinance.

## ATTACHMENTS

1. Proposed Ordinance (including Exhibit A - Proposed Zoning Code Text Amendments)
2. Planning Commission Resolution No. 2018-P008 with Exhibit A: Proposed Zoning Code Text Changes in "strikethrough/underline" format



3. Parking Summary Tables
4. EV Parking Ratio Calculations
5. Mixed Use Development Zone Text Amendment P2017-0239-ZCA
6. Parking Code Amendment Strategies Matrix

## **MOTION**

That the City Council

1. Introduce an Ordinance approving Zoning Code Amendment P2018-0186-ZCA, amending Title 17, Zoning, of the Culver City Municipal Code (CCMC), Chapter 17.320 - Off-Street Parking and Loading.

## **NOTES**

1. There is potential latent demand for use of electric vehicles which can be partly met by removing barriers to electric vehicle operation. UCLA Luskin Center "Overcoming Barriers to Electric Vehicle Charging in Multi-unit Dwellings - A Westside Cities Case Study Chapters 3.1-3.2. The Luskin report indicates multi-unit dwellings (MUD's) comprise (10,774 units) 32% of residential land (area). The US Census ACS for 2013-2017 indicates that residential units in structures with 3 or more dwellings comprise 8,316 units, which is 47.87% of all units (housing) in the City. The City's definition of "multi-family housing" is based on a threshold of four or more units.
2. The UCLA Luskin Report does not make a recommendation or have any data as to requirements/ratios
3. TOD Visioning Parking Standards and Policies, Pg.75