File #: 22-636, **Version:** 1 **Item #:** A-1.

PC - ACTION ITEM: (1) Part 3 of Review and Discussion of Update and Informational Materials and Survey Regarding Comprehensive Revisions to Zoning Code Requirements and Standards Relating to Required Off-Street Parking Citywide; and (2) Direction to Staff Related to Discussion Items.

Meeting Date: May 25, 2022

Contact Person/Dept: Gabriela Silva, Associate Planner
Andrea Fleck, Planning Technician

Phone Number: (310) 253-5736 / (310) 253-5737

Fiscal Impact: Yes [] No [X] **General Fund:** Yes [] No [X]

Public Hearing: [] **Action Item:** [X] **Attachments:** [X]

City Council Action Required: Yes [] No [X] **Date:** N/A

Public Notification: (Email) Meetings and Agendas - Planning Commission (05/19/2022)

Department Approval: Sol Blumenfeld, Community Development Director (05/12/2022)

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the Planning Commission (1) continue discussion of the Comprehensive Parking Code Update strategies presented August 11, 2021 and October 13, 2021, and of additional requested information, including community survey results; and (2) provide further direction relative to the discussion items.

BACKGROUND

The City is advancing several mobility and transportation strategies related to off-street parking. City parking policies have evolved toward requiring less parking, concentrating parking at key public areas, sharing parking among uses and in general downsizing the parking footprint in new development in favor of encouraging use of alternative modes of transit.[1]

During the May 2020 joint Planning Commission and City Council study session on Parking and Mobility, staff was directed to prepare a Comprehensive Parking Code Amendment. Subsequently, in May 2021 the City Council acted in support of Assembly Bill (AB) 1401, which would have prohibited cities from implementing minimum parking requirements for any land use within a ½ mile of certain transit infrastructure. Though the bill was never approved by the State, this was an additional signal of the direction in which the City wishes to proceed. Staff continued to research potential parking code changes and on August 11, 2021, staff presented the Planning Commission with summaries of the research conducted and proposed parking code amendments for consideration. During the discussion, the Planning Commission provided feedback to staff on the items

listed below and, in general, Planning Commission responded favorably to the concepts, though some Commissioners expressed a desire for a more measured approach regarding to some of the concepts, like fully eliminating parking minimums.

- *Minimum Required Parking Ratios*: General reduction of required off-street parking, based on survey of other jurisdictions and consultation of ITE Parking Generation Manual. Full elimination of minimum required quantities/ratios consistent with AB 1401 was favored by only some Commissioners. This bill has not moved forward.

- *Parking Maximums:* Establish a cap on how much surplus parking may be provided, with any excess parking subject to payment of a fee (e.g., mobility fee) as a penalty, and exceptions for some small-scale residential projects. The Planning Commission supported establishing a surplus cap and fee. Some Commissioners conveyed interest in allowing flexibility for owners/developers to determine how much parking their projects/sites need, whether to accept parking reductions, and allowing some surplus parking before a fee is triggered.

- *Parking Reductions:* Establish automatic reductions to required parking when a project implements alternative parking solutions or mobility improvements/measures (specified by the Zoning Code), with a combined maximum reduction of 40 percent,[2] including a reduction for implementation of a Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Plan when applicable.

- *Transportation Demand Management (TDM*): Codify and create a TDM Plan requirement with a robust set of measures, and with an associated parking reduction (approx. 10-15%, counted toward 40% max). A TDM Plan would be required for projects meeting certain tiered thresholds, with larger projects required to incorporate more TDM measures than smaller projects.

- *Bicycle Parking*: Revise current bicycle parking requirements for general increase in required bicycle parking with additional requirements pertaining to size, placement, etc. and allow a tradeoff of bicycle parking and facilities for vehicle parking.

- *Automated and Stacked Parking:* Establish a citywide threshold for administrative review of automated and stacked (vertical) parking (e.g. smaller scale parking), in order to streamline the process for allowing this type of parking.[3] The Commission favored creating an administrative process for automated and stacked parking facilities currently subject to a Site Plan Review (SPR) or Conditional Use Permit (CUP), while maintaining all other requirements currently in place (e.g. technical studies, operations plan, etc.) with consideration of sensitive receptors (e.g. residential zones).

Following deliberations on the above, the Planning Commission continued discussion on the items pertaining to parking reductions for mobility measures.

Staff returned to the Planning Commission on October 13, 2021 to continue the discussion. The Planning Commission discussed the concepts listed below and revisited some of the topics discussed in the previous meeting, provided feedback, and requested additional research. The comments from the Commission were voluminous and complex requiring staff to address each comment extensively to effectively move forward toward drafting code language. In addition, seventeen (17) members of the public provided comments regarding the item.

Parking Reductions for Mobility Features. Allowing reductions to required parking through implementation of the mobility features noted below.

- In-Lieu Fees: Allow a parking reduction by payment of a fee in-lieu (for a portion required parking to address project mobility features. Fees could be paid on a price per stall basis without additional

considerations and would simply apply toward provision of mobility features within the associated project area.

- Car-Share: Allow a parking reduction for certain uses (e.g. mixed-use developments, hotels, and motels) with provision of on-site car-share
- Carpool/Vanpool: Allow a parking reduction for certain uses with the provision of preferential parking for rideshare vehicles and rideshare matching
- Bikeshare: Allow a parking reduction for certain developments that incorporate on-site bikeshare or are within a certain distance from City-sponsored bikeshare facility
- Proximity to Transit: Allow a parking reduction for certain uses within 0.25 and 0.5 miles of a major transit stop.
- Travel Subsidies and Financial Incentives: Allow a parking reduction for certain uses, for the implementation of specific subsidies for alternative transit modes including the following:
    - Metro Pass Subsidy
    - Bike-Share Subsidy
    - Parking Space Cash-Out Program
    - Commuter Incentives for Non-drive-alone Modes
    - Subsidized Rideshare Vehicles
    - Pre-tax Transportation Benefits
- Unbundled Parking: Allow a parking reduction (e.g. 15%) for certain developments/uses (e.g. non-residential, mixed-use) within the TOD or certain distance from eligible transit, when all development parking is unbundled
- Ride-Hail: Allow a parking reduction for commercial uses that incorporate on-site ride-hail parking
- Bicycle Parking: Allow a parking reduction for non-residential and mixed-use developments that provide bicycle parking more than minimum bicycle requirements
- Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Plan: Establish a requirement for a TDM Plan that incorporates a minimum combination of mobility measures, which have varying associated point values. The requirement for a TDM Plan will be based on project size, with the minimum required number of points (and mobility measures) tiered such that larger projects have a higher point value requirement. The mobility measures (above) with an assigned reduction would have a lower/zero-point value since those measures already have an associated parking reduction.
    - Multi-modal Infrastructure (e.g. carshare, bike facilities, etc.)
    - Travel Subsidies and Financial Incentives
    - Automobile Trip Consolidation
        - Shuttle Service
        - Ride-Share Matching Program
        - Guaranteed Ride Home Program
    - Scheduling
        - Compressed Work Week
        - Remote Work
        - Staggered Shifts/Flexible Work Hours
    - Promotion
        - On-site Services and Amenities (e.g. showers, lockers, etc.)
        - Site-wide TDM Program Coordinator
        - Marketing/Targeted Outreach
    - Other (Optional)
        - Parking Pricing (including for use by general public)
        - Mobility Fee

Public comment during the meeting was primarily in support of reducing or eliminating parking minimums and establishing parking maximums; speakers cited different reasons for supporting these measures, including

housing affordability, climate change, improving mobility, etc. There were some speakers who expressed opposition to reducing off-street parking requirements citing concerns such as increased congestion (from drivers searching for parking), economic decline for businesses and developer concerns that parking maximums are inconsistent with tenant desires

The feedback provided by the Planning Commission included the following.

- Allow vehicle parking reductions for providing bicycle parking to be based on providing required bicycle parking rather than surplus bicycle parking
- Allow parking reductions to be higher for bikeshare, bicycle parking, and other alternative modes that are not vehicle-oriented, and lower for ridehail and careshare
- Allow for a higher combined reduction beyond forty (40) percent
- Provide more detail on the TDM thresholds that consider scale of projects
- Provide sample scenarios using the proposed measures to better illustrate potential implementation methods and outcomes

The additional research requested included review of the parking standards for Minneapolis, review of City of Los Angeles' Transit Oriented Communities Incentive Program, further review of the reductions for bicycle parking from City of Los Angeles and City of Santa Monica. Staff researched the above and examined the parking requirements for the cities suggested by Commission.

Staff clarified during the meeting that the approach to the discussion is focused on the higher parking generating uses/developments. In addition, staff clarified that certain residential parking standards would also be informed by Housing Element Update (HEU) and General Plan Update (GPU), which are underway.

ANALYSIS/DISCUSSION

The analysis below summarizes the Planning Commission's prior comments and provides responses.

Comments and Responses

- Dana Sayles:
  1. Would like to see more information from other cities regarding changes affecting residential multi-family and single-family.

     During the meeting staff conveyed that the HEU residential land use options could inform much of the direction regarding parking for smaller-scale residential development. The HEU has been approved by the City and the approval process continues with the State Department of Housing and Community Development. Below is a summary of the City's current parking ratios and ratios from other cities that can inform new parking standards.

powered by Legistar™

Residential Parking Ratios				
	Single Family	Duplex and Triplex	Multi-Family (4+ units)	Guest
Santa Monica	2 per unit	Studio – 1 per unit* 1 bed – 1.5 per unit* 2+beds – 2 per unit*	(Same as duplex/ triplex)	1 per 5 units (affordable: 0 spaces)
West Hollywood	2 per unit (+1 for second unit)	Studio up to 500 sq. ft. – 1 space Studio & 1-bed > than 500 – 1.5 per unit 2-3 beds – 2 per unit 4+beds – 3 per unit	Same as duplex/ triplex	1 per 4 units
Pasadena	2 per unit	2 per unit	1 per unit < 650 sq. ft. 2 per unit ≥ 650 sq. ft.	1 per 10 units
Berkeley	By District (R-3, R-4, R-5) 1 to 9 units (if roadway less than 26-ft in Hillside Overlay) – 1 per unit 10+ units (if roadway less than 26-ft in Hillside Overlay) – 1 per 1,000 sq. ft. All other Districts (if roadway less than 26-ft in Hillside Overlay) – 1 per unit None required for districts not listed			
Portland, OR	No parking is required for residential uses in the single-dwelling zones. For all other zones, the minimum number of required parking spaces for a site with a residential use is: 0 to 30 dwelling units – no parking required 31 to 40 dwelling units – 0.20 spaces per unit (min) 41 to 50 dwelling units – 0.25 spaces per unit (min) 51 or more dwelling units – 0.33 spaces per unit (min)			
Seattle, WA	1 per unit	1 per unit	1 per unit, or 1 per each 2 efficiency units**	None noted
Minneapolis MN	No minimum and no maximum	No minimum and no maximum	2 per unit max; 1.5 per unit max in specified transit areas	No standard
ITE	Not Listed	Not Listed	Not Listed	Not Listed
Culver City	2 per unit	2 per unit	Studio micro-unit – 0.5 per unit Studio & 1 bed ≤ 900 sq. ft – 1 per unit Studio & 1 bed > 900 sq. ft. – 2 per unit 2-3 bed – 2 per unit 4-bed – 3 per unit 1 space for every additional bedroom above 4.	1 per 4 units

*50% reduction for “affordable”
**None required for “affordable”

2. Believes there is still a need for both minimums and maximums. Expressed the market will influence how much parking is provided. Would like to create a ‘happy medium’, as to how much parking is required/provided, between our current requirements and no parking.

   Staff believes the City can consider a hybrid approach. Some cities have maximums for just certain districts or uses but maintain minimums for some circumstances, while other cities have

various caps.

City	Approach to Parking Maximums
Santa Monica	Hybrid Still requires minimums (e.g. Citywide and Parking Overlay Area 1) Parking maximums are applied in the following circumstances to the Downtown Community Plan Area
San Francisco	Maximums only No parking is required for nearly all uses, and all parking ratios are maximum allowable (Planning Commission consideration of a Conditional Use required for any excess parking where allowed)
Berkeley	Hybrid Still requires minimums. Parking maximums are applied in the following circumstances: Commercial (C-W) District: 5:1,000 sq. ft. (food service) and 4:1,000 sq. ft. (all other commercial) Manufacturing Districts: Specific uses at different rates (per table) Residential uses: within 1/4 mile of major transit stop or along (qualified) transit corridor - 0.5 per dwelling unit
Minneapolis	Hybrid (per the standards below) Developments with non-residential uses to provide no fewer than 10 total parking spaces on a zoning lot The City's table of uses with ratios represent the maximum allowable parking (rather than minimum) for each use based on 3 location categories (i.e. citywide and 2 transit districts) A zoning lot shall not contain more than 100 vehicle parking spaces in a surface parking lot
Hartford, CT	Required parking is equal to maximum parking The City's table of uses with ratios represent the required parking and are also the maximum allowable parking for each use Several uses require a 'special permit review' or site plan review to determine required parking

As it relates to the specific items concerning the number of parking spaces that may be required for a particular development or site, the first item assessed is the existing Zoning Code Table 3-3, which currently functions to specify the minimum required parking. Based on research and feedback from Planning Commission and City Council, this table could be revised to reduce the amount of required off-street parking as may be suggested by the research data. For example, the current requirement for office uses is one (1) space for 350 sq. ft. of gross floor area. Based on the research conducted by staff of other jurisdictions and the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Parking Generation Manual (2019), staff concluded a range of required parking as low as one (1) space per 1,000 sq. ft. and as high as one (1) space per 300 sq. ft., with an average of one (1) space per 500 sq. ft. If the City chooses to adopt the average number. That would represent a thirty (30) percent reduction from the current minimum required rate. It is expected that most ratios/rates will be proposed to be reduced based on the research, and reductions in these rates could range from ten (10) to thirty (30) percent depending on the direction of the Planning Commission and City Council.

For parking maximums (and minimums), there are several methodologies implemented throughout the country as listed below and as shown in the examples above.

- Adopting a table that lists the maximum parking allowed for all uses (as a ratio or as a set

number), with no minimum required (e.g. a project/site could potentially provide zero parking)

- Implementing a cap that allows a surplus above the (minimum) required as percentage or as a fixed number (e.g. maximum surplus of 2 spaces or 5% (whichever is greater) above the required minimums)
- Variations of the above include setting such maximums, but only for certain zones/districts or only for certain uses; or allowing a surplus through a discretionary process, such as a use permit

The concept suggested by staff is to keep the (minimum) required parking table while reducing the required rates and adding a cap for surplus parking (without discretionary review). The cap would be a percentage of the required parking and the percentage would be tiered, such that projects with more parking would be allowed a lower percentage of surplus. For example, projects/sites required to provide up to 100 spaces could be allowed a surplus of fifteen (15) percent while projects/sites required to provide more than 100 spaces could be allowed a surplus of ten (10) percent. As noted in the research provided by staff, caps based on percentages range from five (5) to fifty (50) percent (no limit in some cases). In any case, any such surplus would be subject to payment of a fee. The outcome of this option could be a reduction of on-site parking overall from what is currently required, particularly for projects required to take parking reductions from TDM as explained in response No. 10 and No. 30 below. As noted in the example in response No. 10, a project that currently requires 379 parking spaces, would then be required to provide 159 but limited to a maximum of 175 (total), with the additional 16 (surplus) spaces being subject to payment of a fee. The 159 assumes a 40% maximum reduction and that the project is required to take the reduction. Under this scenario and the noted assumptions, a project currently requiring a minimum of 379 spaces and allowed an unlimited number of spaces, would be required 159 and allowed a maximum of 175, which would be a 51% reduction from current requirements.

3. A ‘one size’ scenario may not be appropriate (for mobility requirements). Believes language should allow flexibility for large developments/businesses while not being burdensome for smaller developments/ businesses.

   Other cities researched did not have a sliding scale for parking requirements in general but did have scale/threshold as to which projects are subject to providing mobility features/TDM, and in many cases differed depending on the feature.
   (Also see information in response No. 30).

Source	Measure	Threshold
Santa Monica	Carpool and Van Pool	All commercial uses where there are more than 50 parking spaces on the site shall provide permanently designated car and vanpool parking spaces
	TDM	Any development that will result in the construction of 7,500 square feet of nonresidential floor area or more, 16 residential units or more, or mixed-use projects of 16 residential units or more with any associated non-residential components. Any business employing 10 or more employees
Glendale	Transportation Demand and Trip Reduction Measures	Three tiers Tier 1: 25,000 sq. ft. nonresidential development or All new residential development with 100+ units, or Mixed-use projects with 50+ residential units and 25,000 sq. ft or more of nonresidential floor area Tier 2: 50,000 sq. ft. nonresidential development Tier 3: 100, 000 sq. ft. nonresidential development
Hermosa Beach	Transportation demand and trip reduction measures	Three tiers of nonresidential development Tier 1: 25,000 sq. ft. Tier 2: 50,000 sq. ft. Tier 3: 100, 000 sq. ft.
Berkeley	TDM	Applicable to specific district(s) New construction with more than 25 parking spaces Any new building with residential units New structures or additions over 20,000 sq. ft.
Portland, OR	Carpool	Carpool parking spaces required for: Office, industrial, and institutional uses with more than 20 parking spaces (5 spaces or 5% of parking spaces on site).
	TPDM Plan	Transportation and parking demand management (TPDM) plan and measures are required in the commercial/mixed use and multi-dwelling zones when new development includes more than 10 dwelling units, or the addition of more than 10 dwelling units
Minneapolis MN	TDM Plan	50 – 249 dwelling units 25,000 – 200,000 sq. ft. non-residential floor area 250 or more dwelling units 200,000+ sq. ft. of non-residential floor area 5,000 sq. ft. of reception/meeting floor area 10,000 sq. ft. of shopping center floor area Any use, building, or expansion as determined by the Planning Director and City Engineer
St. Paul, MN	TDM Plan	New or phased construction of 20,000 GFA or more of a nonresidential use 25 or more new dwelling units. Any development or redevelopment, including phased construction, over 40,000 sq. ft. Any development or redevelopment providing 100 or more accessory off-street parking spaces Any change resulting in a parking increase of 25%, or 50% accessory off-street parking spaces, whichever is less, and providing 100 or more parking spaces

4. Recommends requirements to be scaled and respond to the project size.
See above. (Also see information in response No. 30).

5. Would like to table discussion and see more details overall.

   Additional research and responses are provided. In the interest of staff time and resources, draft language and text changes will be provided following completion of Commission discussions.

6. Prefers focus to be on measures that are concrete that can be incorporated into projects (e.g., bikeshare) rather than encouraging using other cars.

   Based on staff's research, cities use a combination of measures. Below is a list of cities that use carshare as a parking reduction measure. Staff believes that given the level of mobility infrastructure currently present, an approach that utilizes a full range of measures would be optimal, particularly as the City transitions into a more robust state of mobility and alternative transit options. One consideration that can be made is to still incorporate carshare as a tool while assigning a more conservative parking reduction.

Source	Ratio	Reduction
SANDAG, Parking Strategies for Smart Growth - June 2010	N/A	2-5% potential reduction
Car-Sharing: Where and How It Succeeds (2005) Report by the National Academies of Sciences Engineering and Medicine	1 carshare vehicle: 5 cars	20% of car-share members give up their car
Santa Monica, CA	1 carshare space: 2 required parking spaces	25% maximum or 10 spaces, whichever is less
Denver, CO	1 carshare space: 5 required parking spaces	No maximum reduction
West Hollywood, CA	1 carshare space: 2 required parking spaces	4 spaces maximum
Austin, TX	1 carshare space: 20 required parking spaces	40% cumulative reduction (for any one or combination of measures)
Prior Project Requirement / Condition (3727 Robertson - Mixed-Use)	1 carshare space: 0 required parking spaces	None (part of consideration for overall parking reduction)

7. Prefers reductions for bicycle parking to be associated with simply meeting required bicycle parking rather than for excess bicycle parking, so would like that measure to be refined (like City of Los Angeles)

   The Planning Commission can make this part of their recommendation as part of the review of draft a text amendment. Staff believes that although a goal of the amendment is to reduce parking footprint, that robust minimum bicycle parking requirements should be adhered to without parking reductions first and reductions provided once the minimums are met. This is given that the current parking ratios will likely be lower in the future. Some cities surveyed require that bicycle parking be excess to qualify for a parking reduction.

Source	Reduction
Los Angeles	10-30% - for providing minimum required bicycle parking
Santa Monica	15% - for non-required bicycle spaces
Glendale	10% - for bicycle parking above required
Berkeley	10% - for bicycle parking above minimum required
Seattle, WA	20% - for long-term bicycle parking provided (not specified as above required)
Portland, OR	25% - for non-required bicycle spaces
Bend, OR	5-10% - for providing twice as many covered, secured bike racks as required by code
Minneapolis, MN	No reduction – required as TDM at a 50% greater rate than otherwise required by code

8. Consider scooter docking station or similar mobility hub as a mobility measure.

   Staff consulted Public Works and Transportation Departments. The Transportation Department is currently working on Mobility Hub Standards with corresponding consultants and will coordinate with Current Planning as that progresses to ensure consistency and compatibility. At this time, Public Works does not allow micro-mobility in the public right-of-way, so these improvements, if required, would have to be accommodated on-site or as determined in the future (e.g., as part of Transportation Department's mobility hub requirements/standards).

9. Would like proposed measures to be easy to use (e.g., not require additional City Council action).

   The initial approach by staff is for mobility measures and parking reductions to be automatic to create standards that are clear and can be implemented efficiently, although some cities surveyed do require a use permit for some reductions or in some districts. However, some items may require action or consideration by the Director, Planning Commission, and/or City Council, as ultimately decided by Council as part of the final Zoning Code Amendment language.

10. Agrees the discussion would benefit from seeing concrete examples applying the proposed measures.

    Below is a sample scenario with a proposed project description taken from an actual project that has been approved.

    Example Scenario - Multi-story 132,500 sq. ft. office development (similar to 8777 Washington Blvd)

    - Based on current requirements, requires 379 parking spaces, 392 provided, surplus of 13
    - Using the average ratio (1:500 described above in response No. 2), could require as few as 265 spaces (114 (i.e. 30%) less than current code)
    - Based on the scale of the project, would be required to prepare a TDM Plan (as explained in responses No. 3 above and No. 30 below), incorporating mobility measures from all categories (multi-modal infrastructure, travel subsidies and financial incentives, automobile trip consolidation, scheduling, and promotion)
    - A reduction would be applied for the TDM Plan and for mobility measures assigned a reduction (based on what is incorporated into the TDM Plan for the required number of points for the corresponding tier). Assuming the 40% maximum previously discussed, the new base required parking would be 159 spaces (220 (58%) less than current code)

- The parking maximum (or surplus parking) would be allowed based on a cap (to be determined) from the 159 spaces; assuming a 10% allowance, 16 surplus spaces could be allowed, subject to payment of a fee

11. Recommends that state mandated measures not be codified since changes would trigger changing our Code.

    State mandated measures, as it relates to parking, will not be codified. If there is a state measure for a parking reduction that applies to a project, and the project qualifies for a reduction under the Zoning Code, these may be able to be combined, similar to how density increases from the State can be combined with those provided for in the Zoning Code. This is subject to determination of the City Council during consideration of the Zoning Code Amendment.

12. Would like to see more information on proposed reductions/credits for change of use for existing structures; would like for it to be geared toward helping existing sites to thrive and expand uses without hinderance of additional parking.
    Staff found that neighboring cities use a variety of approaches to address parking requirements for change of use within an existing structure. As shown in the table below, approaches vary from waiving a certain amount of parking spaces required by the change of use, to allowing a change of use without any additional parking. Staff is considering an approach that would waive a certain amount of parking spaces required by the change of use.

Source	Parking credits for change of use
Santa Monica, CA	No additional parking required if the change of use creates 3 or fewer required parking spaces.
West Hollywood, CA	No additional parking required if the change of use is from a non-residential use to another non-residential use, or if the structure or tenant space is less than 6,000 sf.
Pasadena, CA	A change of use shall provide the minimum required number of parking spaces required for the new use.
Seattle, WA	A change of use shall provide the minimum required number of parking spaces required for the new use, except that up to 20 required parking spaces are waived for new non-residential uses in existing structures in commercial and industrial zones.
Hermosa Beach, CA	No additional parking is required for a change of use, except for late night alcohol establishments

- Jen Carter

13. Based on experience of reading articles by experts on parking/mobility, agrees the City should eliminate parking minimums and eliminate car use/dependency as it will be a move for the environment and for housing.

14. Supports the parking/mobility Zoning Code amendments and believes concepts are going in the right direction; staff should move forward to make progress.

15. Amendment should aim for a higher parking reduction allowance than forty (40) percent.

    Based on staff's research the forty (40) percent threshold was derived using the range of reductions found as listed below. Staff's approach was to find a mid-point that would be a smoother transition from current standards. In addition, since parking ratios are also being generally reduced overall (as described in response No. 2 above), the reduction from mobility measures and TDM would essentially be greater than forty (40) percent from what is required

currently.

Source	Reduction Cap
San Diego, CA	15% maximum parking reduction
Seattle, WA	50% maximum parking reduction
Portland, OR	50% maximum parking reduction
Glendale, CA	30% maximum parking reduction
Denver, CO	50% maximum parking reduction
Austin, TX	40% maximum parking reduction
West Hollywood, CA	No maximum cumulative reduction specified
San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG), Parking Strategies for Smart Growth - June 2010	No more than 75% parking reduction recommended.

- Ed Ogosta

16. Would like more information on when measures are optional and when measures are required.

Generally, mobility measures are optional when associated with parking reductions. Further, when part of a TDM plan requirement, a given mobility measure may not be specifically required but rather selected from a menu of options to fulfill a requirement of the required TDM plan. Below are a few examples of when mobility measures area required, as well as when a TDM plan is required.

Source	Measure	Required/Not Required
Santa Monica	Carpool and Van Pool	Required – if meeting threshold
	Unbundled Parking	Required – if within a certain district, for both residential and non-residential; 100% affordable housing projects are exempt
	TDM	Required – if meeting threshold (square feet, number of units)
Glendale	TDM and Trip Reduction measures	Required – if meeting threshold (square feet, number of units, etc.)

powered by Legistar™

Source	Measure	Required/Not Required
Hermosa Beach	TDM and Trip Reduction measures	Required – if meeting threshold (square feet)
San Diego	Unbundled Parking	Required – all developments, except for residential that also meet specific affordability thresholds
Berkeley	TDM	Required – if meeting threshold (use, square feet, parking spaces)
	Unbundled Parking	Required – if within a certain district for any development with residential (a Use Permit may be requested to waive this requirement for projects that include affordable housing)
Portland, OR	Carpool	Required – if meeting threshold (use and number of parking spaces)
	TPDM Plan	Required – if meeting threshold (number of units)
Minneapolis, MN	TDM Plan	Required – if meeting threshold (number of units, square feet)
St. Paul, MN	TDM Plan	Required – if meeting threshold (square feet, number of units, number of parking spaces)

17. Would like to understand how many current projects have TDM Plans.
Since the Zoning Code does not currently require TDM Plans, there are currently no projects that have a formal TDM Plan. However, as projects have been presented to the Planning Commission and/or City Council over the past few years, the City has required incorporation of TDM measures as Conditions of Approval. Below is a list of past projects that were required to incorporate TDM measures as part of the Conditions of Approval. In addition, Transportation, Public Works, and Community Development Departments will be working jointly on drafting a TDM Ordinance and TDM Plan requirements.

	TDM Measures Required as Conditions of Approval							
	TDM Plan	TAP Card Subsidy	Car-Share	Bike-Share	Ride-share	Mobility Fund	Ridehail	Comply with CCMC Title 7
8777 Washington (Apple Offices)	X	X		X	X	X		X
8888 Washington		X		X		X	X	
8801-8809 Washington Blvd. (Ivy Station)	X	X			X		x	X
6161 Centinela (Entrada)	X							
12337 Washington (Culver Public Market)		X						

powered by Legistar™

	TDM Measures Required as Conditions of Approval							
	TDM Plan	TAP Card Subsidy	Car-Share	Bike-Share	Ride-share	Mobility Fund	Ridehail	Comply with CCMC Title 7
9336 Washington Blvd (Culver Studios)	X	X		x	X	X	X	X
3939 Landmark (Park Century School)		X			X	X		X
3727 Robertson (Mixed-Use Project)		X	X				X	X

18. There is a need for both parking minimums and parking maximums; we are operating within that grey area.
See information in response No. 2 above.

19. All the measures presented are good ideas but need more information on how we would implement to have a stronger opinion (different cities in examples implement measures differently, but unclear which is the best fit for Culver City).

See example in response No. 10 above. This illustrates staff's approach to the standards. This is a measured approach that allows a smoother transition from what is currently required by the Zoning Code and currently implemented for discretionary projects to the future requirements/standards, while transportation and mobility infrastructure continues to develop into the more robust condition that is needed.

20. Would like more details on the actual language to have a more in-depth discussion.
Additional research and responses are provided. Draft language and text changes will be provided following completion of discussions.

21. Would like to see examples/summaries of how these might be implemented and give feedback on which seem reasonable, and which might be excessive.
See example in response No. 10 above.

- Nancy Barba

22. Generally supports the intent, but need to also address multi-family and single-family residential and not bifurcate land uses.
See response No. 1 above.

23. Supports eliminating minimums and studying instituting parking maximums.
Staff believes there is some value to maintaining some minimum parking requirements, even if at nominal ratios. Some cities that incorporate parking maximums do so in a hybrid approach where some minimums are required, such that not all uses, or locations have zero parking required (see item No. 2 above).

24. Ridehailing does produce more carbon emissions, so would like to see parking reductions to be shifted to bicycle parking, bikeshare, and rideshare and less on ridehail and carshare.

Based on staff's research, emissions produced by car-share and ridehail vehicles have traditionally outweighed the emissions reductions resulting from associated decreases in vehicle ownership.

However, studies also show that the shift toward vehicle electrification may make car-sharing and ridehailing more climate-friendly soon. In fact, in 2021, the California Air Resources Board (CARB) adopted regulations for ridehail companies to achieve an electrification target of 90% electric Vehicle Miles Travel (VMT) and an emissions target of 0 grams of CO_2 per passenger-mile-traveled by 2030. The regulations require that ridehail companies (e.g. Uber, Lyft) submit a compliance plan every two years beginning January 1, 2022 and a compliance summary report yearly. One 2020 study by the Union of Concerned Scientists indicated that an electric non-pooled ridehail trip generates 53% less emissions than a private vehicle, while an electric pooled ride-hailing trip generates about 68% less emissions than a private vehicle trip in the average car.

One of the primary objectives of the amendments to the City's parking requirement is to decrease the parking footprint. Staff believes that while ridehail and car-share measures may not currently result in emissions reductions, car-oriented mobility measures are still be a viable parking reduction strategy that will help achieve this objective as the City continues to develop its mass transit infrastructure over time.

25. Would like the combination of mobility measures to add up to having a lot less parking (e.g., a higher parking reduction than 40%).
See response No. 15 above.

26. Mobility measures/parking reduction are going in the right direction, but do not go far enough.

27. Strongly supports unbundling parking.

28. Would like to see us emulating 'transit-oriented communities' that are done in City of Los Angeles.

As defined by Metro, Transit Oriented Communities (TOCs) are places (such as corridors or neighborhoods) that, by their design, allow people to drive less and access transit more. A Transit Oriented Community maximizes equitable access to a multi-modal transit network as a key organizing principle of land use planning and holistic community development. TOCs differ from Transit Oriented Development (TOD) in that a TOD is a specific building or development project that is fundamentally shaped by proximity to transit. TOCs promote equity and sustainable living in a diversity of community contexts by: (a) offering a mix of uses that support transit ridership of all income levels (e.g. housing, jobs, retail, services and recreation); (b) ensuring appropriate building densities, parking policies, and urban design that support accessible neighborhoods connected by multi-modal transit; (c) elevating vulnerable users and their safety in design; and (d) ensuring that transit related investments provide equitable benefits that serve local, disadvantaged and underrepresented communities.

The Transit Oriented Communities program from City of Los Angeles focuses on affordable housing. The State already implements provisions pertaining to parking rates for affordable housing, which is referenced in City of LA's TOC Guidelines, and with which the City will continue to comply. As noted in item No. 11 above, the City Council may determine as part of consideration of the future Zoning Code Amendment, if additional parking reductions will be allowed for projects already utilizing State parking standards.

City of LA TOC Guidelines – Parking Standards
a. Residential Minimum Parking Requirements. i. Tiers 1-3 - Required automobile parking for all residential units in an Eligible Housing Development (not just the restricted affordable units), inclusive of disabled and required guest parking, where applicable, shall be as follows: 1. For an Eligible Housing Development, required parking for all residential units shall not exceed 0.5 spaces per bedroom 2. For an Eligible Housing Development that consists of 100% On-Site Restricted Affordable units, exclusive of a manager's unit units, there shall be no required parking for all residential units in the Eligible Housing Development 3. Tier 2 - Regardless of the number of bedrooms in each unit, parking for all residential units in an Eligible Housing Development shall not be required to exceed 1 space per unit 4. Tier 3 - Required parking for all residential units in an Eligible Housing Development shall not exceed 0.5 spaces per unit ii. Tier 4 – No required parking for residential units in an Eligible Housing Development. b. Rounding. If the total number of parking spaces required for a development is other than a whole number, the number shall be rounded up to the next whole number. c. Unbundling. Required parking may be sold or rented separately from the units, except for all Restricted Affordable Units which shall include any required parking in the base rent or sales price, as verified by HCIDLA. d. Bicycle Parking. The bicycle parking requirements in LAMC 12.21 A.16 apply. The additional options to further reduce automobile parking through bicycle parking replacement in LAMC 12.21 A.4 do not apply to TOC projects. e. Nonresidential Parking. A mixed-use project may reduce the nonresidential automobile parking requirement for any ground-floor nonresidential use as follows: i. Tier 1 – Up to a 10% reduction in the nonresidential parking requirement ii. Tier 2 – Up to a 20% reduction in the nonresidential parking requirement iii. Tier 3 – Up to a 30% reduction in the nonresidential parking requirement iv. Tier 4 – Up to a 40% reduction in the nonresidential parking requirement f. Consistency. Parking reductions offered for Eligible Housing Developments shall always be consistent or greater than those in California Government Code Section 65915(p)

29. We should look at measures from the State and the City of Minneapolis.

Staff has researched the code from Minneapolis and included the relevant measures, below is a summary of the general parking standards. State measures will be addressed as noted in response No. 11 above.

City of Minneapolis – Parking Standards Summary
Parking minimums/maximums: Hybrid approach (per the standards below) • Developments with non-residential uses to provide no fewer than 10 total parking spaces on a zoning lot • City's parking ratios represent the maximum allowable parking (rather than minimum) for each use based on 3 location categories (i.e. citywide and 2 transit districts), with lower maximums allowed in transit districts • A zoning lot shall not contain more than 100 vehicle parking spaces in a surface parking lot (Note: the general citywide maximum for general commercial uses is higher than Culver City's current minimum) Minimum bicycle and EV parking required by use TDM Plan is required for uses/developments meeting specific thresholds • 50 – 249 dwelling units • 25,000 – 200,000 sq. ft. non-residential floor area • 250 or more dwelling units • 200,000+ sq. ft. of non-residential floor area • 5,000 sq. ft. of reception/meeting floor area • 10,000 sq. ft. of shopping center floor area • Any use, building, or expansion as determined by the Planning Director and City Engineer TDM plans must meet minimum point quantity specified; no parking reductions are provided (due to above minimums/maximums) TDM plans may choose which measures to incorporate from the list below (provided they meet the minimum point quantity) • Transit passes • Zero vehicle parking (except for accessible spaces, carshare, and up to 3 drop-off/pick-up spaces) • Transit fare subsidy (30% minimum of cost) • Limited vehicle parking (30% or less of maximum) • Pedestrian improvements • Shower, locker, and bicycle storage • Carshare • Unbundled parking • Real time transit information • As proposed by applicant, subject to determination and acceptance by the Planning Director and City Engineer

30. Prefers the menu approach, rather than dictating which measures they must incorporate, but should focus on incentivizing measures that are needed in the City, that reduce VMT and traffic.

    Staff's approach is a menu approach that requires projects exceeding certain thresholds (to be determined) to provide mobility/TDM measures, while other projects that do not meet specified thresholds would be completely optional. See response No. 3 above for sample thresholds. In addition, below are some suggested thresholds.

	Possible Thresholds for Projects Required to implement TDM
Tier 1	15,000 sq. ft. to 30,000 sq. ft. of non-residential floor area, or Mixed-use with greater than 10 dwelling units
Tier 2	Greater than 30,000 sq. ft. up to 60,000 sq. ft., or Mixed-use with greater than 11 to 65 dwelling units
Tier 3	Greater than 60,000 sq. ft., or Mixed-use with greater than 65 dwelling units

Note: The current threshold for Title 7 - Transportation Demand and Trip Reduction Measures are 25,00 sq. ft., 50,000 sq. ft., and 100,000 sq. ft. In addition, current thresholds for site plan review are 5,000 sq. ft. (administrative), 15,000 sq. ft., and 10 or more dwelling units; the threshold being considered under streamlining discussion is 10 dwelling units. The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) uses 6 dwelling units and 10,000 sq. ft. as thresholds for some of the basic categorical exemptions.

For projects not meeting the thresholds that will be established (e.g., those noted above), all mobility measures will be optional, and would need to meet eligibility criteria for parking reductions as may be determined. Projects that exceed the thresholds would be required to implement a TDM plan. The higher tiers would be required to incorporate more measures. The required TDM plan would have a menu of options such as the one listed below, and the project would be required to select from a minimum number of categories and a minimum number of measures depending on the tier.

Potential TDM Menu
TDM Category/Measure
Multi-modal Infrastructure
Rideshare preferential parking
Carshare parking
Bikeshare on-site
Travel Subsidies and Financial Incentives
Metro Employer Annual Pass Program
Bikeshare subsidy
Parking space cash-out program
Commuter financial incentives for non-drive-alone modes
Subsidized carpool/vanpool vehicles
Automobile Trip Consolidation
Rideshare matching programs
Shuttle Services
Guaranteed Ride Home Program

Potential TDM Menu
TDM Category/Measure
Scheduling
Staggered Shifts / Flexible Work Hours
Compressed Work Week
Remote Work
Promotion
Site-wide TDM Program Coordinator
On-site services and amenities
Marketing/outreach
Other (Optional)
Parking Pricing
Mobility Fee

31. If projects/developers do not want to reduce their parking through mobility features, the parking maximums will address controlling the amount of parking.

    Staff's recommended approach is to incentivize parking reductions, but still create maximums (a cap), and penalize projects that want to overpark by contributing to a mobility fee.

32. Measures that are not vehicle-oriented (e.g., ridehail, etc.) should have higher points/reductions associated.

    As indicated in response No. 6 above, the various mobility measures can be tailored to assign the number of points and/or parking reductions as determined through the final Amendment language. The figures initially presented by staff (below) were based on research collected and general understanding of which measures would be more likely to result in a reduction in parking demand.

Mobility Measure	Parking Reduction – (40% max. cumulative)
On-site Carshare parking	Up to 25%
On-site Rideshare (carpool/vanpool) designated parking and rideshare matching services	Up to 15%
On-site Ride-hail (e.g. Uber, Lyft) parking	Up to 30%
Located within 1,000 feet of City-sponsored Bikeshare or provide on-site Bikeshare (including e-cargo bikes)	Up to 10%
Provide surplus bicycle parking	Up to 15%
Unbundle parking from cost of tenant space	15 %

Mobility Measure	Parking Reduction – (40% max. cumulative)
In-lieu parking fees (recast existing language so that fees fund mobility projects instead of parking facilities)	Up to 30%
Proximity to Transit : within ½ mile from a Transit Priority Area (TPA) or high-quality transit corridor	Up to 30%
Provide transit subsidies and financial incentives • Metro Employer Annual Pass Program • Bikeshare subsidy • Subsidized rideshare (carpool/vanpool) vehicle • Parking space cash-out (when parking is unbundled) • Commuter financial incentives for non drive-alone modes • Pre-tax transportation benefits	 15% 5% 5% (car) or 10% (van) 5% 15% 5%

Staff Comments *(10/13/2021)*

1. Parking amendment is being presented in a way that highlights our highest parking demand uses, such as mixed-use. In addition, the City is addressing multi-family and single-family residential land uses as part of the General Plan Update (GPU), and we need to understand the final disposition of those land uses before determining final associated parking. The Land Use Element is in production now and should be available for public discussion shortly.
2. Parking minimums and parking maximums are still part of the discussion.
3. Uses to which parking reductions for mobility measures apply are also informed by research conducted thus far by staff.
4. Measures would not be one size fits all; staff would propose thresholds
5. Proposed framework is that all mobility measures with associated parking reductions are optional, except for projects that meet the threshold that requires a TDM Plan. For those projects required to have a TDM Plan, they would have to incorporate a minimum number of measures (points) from a distinct TDM menu (i.e., they would have some flexibility in selecting which measures they want to incorporate from the different categories).
6. Current TDM measures are not robust so we would require a TDM plan as part of the discretionary review.
7. Staff will revisit City of Santa Monica and City of Los Angeles's bicycle requirements, specifically as it pertains to parking reductions.
8. Infrastructure such as scooter and bikeshare docking is part of the public-right-of-way and so is regulated differently; code amendment will focus on infrastructure that is on-site.
9. Mobility measures will relate to scale of projects; staff will look into size thresholds and order of magnitude for mobility measures.
10. Staff will create examples/summaries to provide more context in terms of how mobility measures apply to and affect a project.
11. Requirements mandated by the State are incorporated into local codes, and local municipalities have the option to be more restrictive; and we realize that if we are going to comply or defer with State law we need to include a reference in the Code.
12. Change of use parking credits need further discussion in conjunction with the non-conforming section of the Code.
13. Some measures may be required (non-optional).
14. Summary: Lean more heavily into bike parking and less into carshare or ridehail, to promote alternative transit. Provide more detail of the measures and how they work (examples, summaries). Look more closely at Santa Monica and City of LA regarding bike parking. Sufficient to move forward. Table the discussion while staff does additional research and provides summaries/examples and return with presentation.

In summary there are many areas of unanimity and some areas of disagreement on the various positions of the Commission on the proposed parking code amendment. Following Planning Commission direction, the matter will be presented to City Council for direction and thereafter staff will commence drafting the amendment for Commission consideration.

Community Outreach and Survey Results

In addition to conducting the additional research requested by the Planning Commission, staff also conducted outreach to a variety of community stakeholders, including residents, business owners, architects, developers, and other local below addresses. Outreach included two stakeholder meetings and a survey questionnaire. The meeting invitations and survey were distributed by email to 410 stakeholders, using a compilation of email lists from various community outreach sources. In addition, the survey link was distributed by email through the City's GovDelivery on April 7, 2022, and the survey was closed at the end of the day on Sunday, April 24, 2022.

The first meeting was held on Wednesday, April 6, 2022 for business, developer, and other non-resident stakeholders, with 22 people in attendance. The second meeting was on Thursday, April 7, 2022 for residents, with 28 people in attendance. During the meetings staff gave a brief presentation outlining the purpose of the meeting, the intent to pursue a Zoning Code Amendment related to parking, the general background and objectives of the parking code, and major areas of study for the parking code. Staff's presentation also included a review of the parking survey. During the first meeting, comments from the public centered around the need to make changes in a way that is balanced and transitional, recognizing the capacity of existing transportation and mobility options, such that changes are not so drastic that developments and their users/occupants are not able to adequately adapt and transition in an appropriate manner. During the second meeting, comments ranged more widely, with some commenters supporting elimination of parking minimums and implementation of parking maximums while others expressed a desire to maintain some minimums.

Staff prepared the survey that was distributed, which is intended to provide a general understanding of the range of opinions of stakeholders in the community. Some stakeholders were critical of the survey as representing a point of view, but staff's intent was to simply provide an overview of the parking issues the Planning Commission was discussing to obtain a broader cross section of public opinion than is obtained through public hearings that generally draw the same stakeholders. There were 447 questionnaires completed. Based on the results, respondents were primarily Culver City residents (392), with 270 being residents only and the remaining 122 indicated they were also a business owner, architect, design professional, developer, or other of the available categories. Only 55 of the respondents were not Culver City residents. Respondents were nearly evenly split between women and men, with only 3 selecting non-binary and 6 'other', while 14 respondents chose to not answer this question. More than half of the respondents (248) were 55 years or more in age, with the 65+ bracket having the most respondents. Nearly all (92.4%) respondents utilize a single-occupancy vehicle(s) as a primary mode of transportation, although only 125 of the respondents use this mode exclusively. The next most utilized mode of transportation reported was walking, followed by bicycling.

Of the respondents that indicated they are Culver City business owners, most indicated they were an office use (21 of 53; 39.6%), followed by 'general services' and by 'media production and creative office'. Most business owners responding had a small number of employees, with the majority (28 of 53; 52.8%) ranging between 1 and 5 employees. A majority indicated they have parking for everyone employed and guests/customers (35 of 53; 66%). At the same time, business owners were evenly split between those indicating there is insufficient parking (43.6%) and those indicating adequate parking (43.6%) around their place of business or employment. Further, most (35 of 55, 63.6%) indicated no incentives are provided for use of alternative transportation.

powered by Legistar™

A majority of architects and design professionals (18 of 24; 75%) work on projects in Culver City. Of the development professionals, nearly all worked on just a few projects (between 1 and 5) in Culver City. Most work on commercial and mixed-use projects, with just a few working on residential or industrial. The scale of projects varied but were primarily large-scale commercial (100,001+ sq. ft.), with the next most being medium-scale (30,001-60,000 sq. ft.) commercial. The two respondents that indicated they represented a school or institution did not respond to the corresponding questions (15 through 18) relating to their scale and parking conditions.

Residents responding to the questionnaire live throughout the various neighborhoods in the City, but a majority (18.4%) live in the Park East neighborhood, which includes Carlson Park, followed by the Park West neighborhood (9.9%). Respondents were nearly evenly split between those who feel there is insufficient parking and adequate parking on residential properties; only a few considered that there is too much parking on residential properties. Most residents felt they live in a transit-friendly area and an even higher percentage felt that they live in a neighborhood with adequate mobility. Based on a list of choices given and a ranking methodology, when asked which mobility features residents would like to see in their neighborhood the highest -ranking measure was shuttle bus service, followed by bikeshare, carshare, more frequent transit service, micro-mobility, closer transit stop(s), unbundled parking, and other. (Methodology: points were assigned to each response based on how the respondent ranked each item. Those points were then summed and averaged across all responses and then the choices ranked based on the final average of points).

Most respondents (61%) indicated there is insufficient parking in larger commercial centers, with very few indicating there is too much parking in such centers. Among residents, 62.8% indicated this response, while among non-residents 49% responded the same. For larger commercial centers, most respondents (50.7%) indicated there is an adequate supply of parking; 56.5% of residents and non-residents responded in this manner. However, most non-residents (38%) indicated such centers have too much parking, while only 9.7% of residents agreed with that statement.

Regarding parking reductions, though most respondents strongly disagreed or disagreed (314 to 317 of 447) with reducing parking requirements in general; most (317 of 447) strongly disagreed or disagreed with general parking reductions for residential development. Conversely, only 22 to 23 percent (approximately 100 of 447) respondents agree, somewhat agree, or strongly agree with general parking reductions. A slight, but noticeable, shift is seen when asked about parking reductions for development near transit. Less respondents strongly disagree or disagree (222 to 233 of 447), while more somewhat agree, agree, and strongly agree with parking reductions for development near transit, than compared to the original prompt. Still, residential development was the least supported for parking reductions even when near transit. Similarly, respondents most (290 of 447, of which 270 are residents) strongly disagreed or disagreed with parking reductions for mobility measures most when associated with residential development. Further, of the respondents agreeing in some way with reductions for mobility measures, most agreed with this in the case of mixed-use development (170 to 195 of 447 respondents, of which 142 to 165 are residents), similar in trend to responses for general reductions and reductions near transit.

Responses to the statements regarding requiring TDM measures for different developments indicate a wider range of sentiment. Although most respondents strongly disagree or disagree with requiring TDM for any of the development types, it is significantly less so than for the parking reduction prompts. In addition, more of the respondents somewhat agree, agree, or strongly agree with requiring TDM measures than those that agree with parking reductions, particularly for large-scale commercial development. Specifically, 222 of 447 respondents disagreed (to some degree) with requiring TDM for large-scale residential development, 198 for large-scale commercial development, and 200 for large-scale mixed-use development; of these respondents 206, 179, and 184 (respectively) are residents. Respondents that agreed in some form with requiring TDM for the 3 development types were 170, 195, and 188 of 447, while 142, 165 and 158, respectively, were residents.

Similarly, responses to the statements regarding implementing parking maximums for different developments

indicate a wider range of sentiment, like the prompt regarding TDM. Although most respondents strongly disagree, it is significantly less so than for the parking reductions posed in the prior prompts. In addition, like the previous prompt, the large-scale residential development category received the most responses of strongly opposed. In summary, 140 of the 447 respondents agree (in some form) with implementing parking maximums for large-scale residential development, 142 for large-scale commercial development, and 147 for large-scale mixed-use development, of which 115, 117, and 121 (respectively) are residents. On the other hand, 239 of 447 respondents disagree (in some form) with implementing parking maximums for large-scale residential development, 232 for large-scale commercial development as well as for large-scale mixed-use development, of which 215, 208, and 209 (respectively) are residents.

One trend of note is that for these questions, responses from non-residents were more evenly spread; however, a higher percentage of these respondents favor parking reductions than residents. On the other hand, favorable responses decreased for requiring TDM measures and implementing parking maximums.

Lastly, respondents were asked to rank a preset list about what mobility measure(s) respondents would most like to see in new developments. The highest-ranking measure was bikeshare, followed by carshare, carpool/vanpool, shuttle bus service, ride-hail loading zone, TAP cards, end-of-trip facilities, micro-mobility, unbundled parking, and other. This was based on assigning points to each response based on how the respondent ranked each item; those points were then averaged across all responses and then the choices ranked based on the final average of points.

See Attachment No. 1 for the full results of the questionnaire responses.

ATTACHMENTS

1. Survey Results

NOTES

1. The City has focused development around transit nodes such as the Transit Oriented Development District adjacent to the Expo Light Rail line, reduced parking requirements by Council resolution when in proximity to transit, required mobility options in Conditions of Approval in new developments, permitted automated parking administratively in parking deficient area and is constructing a pilot circulator project between the TOD District and the downtown.

2. 40% is the maximum parking reduction derived by staff based upon the data found regarding this topic, but may be adjusted at the direction of Planning Commission and/or City Council

3. The Hayden Tract and Smiley Blackwelder areas are parking impacted areas per Section 17.320.025.C where automated parking may be administratively approved.

MOTION

That the Planning Commission:

Continue the discussion of the comprehensive parking code update strategies presented August 11, 2021 and October 13, 2021, and of additional requested information, including community survey results; and provide further direction relative to the discussion items.

powered by Legistar™