



## DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING RECOMMENDATION REPORT



### CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

**DATE:** April 28, 2011  
**TIME:** after 8:30 a.m.\*  
**PLACE:** Van Nuys City Hall  
14410 Sylvan Street  
Council Chambers, 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor  
Van Nuys, CA 91401

**CASE NO:** CPC-2007-2216-CA  
**COUNCIL FILES:** 07-2991; 09-0206  
**CEQA:** ENV-2011-308-ND  
**LOCATION:** Citywide  
**COUNCIL DISTRICT:** All  
**PLAN AREAS:** All

### PUBLIC HEARING REQUIRED

**SUMMARY:** A proposed ordinance (Appendix B) amending Sections 12.04, 12.24, 12.32, 13.00, and adding Section 13.16 of the Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC) to create a Modified Parking Requirement (MPR) District offering seven optional parking requirement modification tools including (1) change of use parking standards, (2) use of a new Parking Reduction Permit, (3) off-site parking within 1500 feet, (4) decreased parking requirements, (5) increased parking requirements, (6) commercial parking credits, and (7) maximum parking limits.

### RECOMMENDED ACTIONS:

1. **Adopt** the staff report as its report on the subject.
2. **Adopt** the findings in Attachment 1.
3. **Adopt** the Negative Declaration (Attachment 2) as the CEQA clearance on the subject.
4. **Disapprove** the previously approved ordinance (Appendix A) and not recommend its adoption by the City Council.
5. **Approve** the proposed ordinance (Appendix B) and recommend its adoption by the City Council.

MICHAEL LOGRANDE  
Director of Planning

ALAN BELL, AICP  
Deputy Director

LINN K. WYATT  
Chief Zoning Administrator

CHARLIE RAUSCH  
Senior City Planner, Office of Zoning Administration

THOMAS ROTHMANN  
City Planner, Code Studies  
Telephone: (213) 978-1891

**ADVICE TO PUBLIC:** \*The exact time this report will be considered during the meeting is uncertain since there may be several other items on the agenda. Written communication may be mailed to the Commission Secretariat, 200 North Main Street, Room 272, Los Angeles, CA 90012 (Phone No. 213/978-1300). While all written communications are given to the Commission for consideration, the initial packets are sent a week prior to the Commission's meeting date. If you challenge these agenda items in court, you may be limited to raising only those issues you or someone else raised at the public hearing agendaized herein, or in written correspondence on these matters delivered to this agency at or prior to the public hearing. As a covered entity under Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act, the City of Los Angeles does not discriminate on the basis of disability, and upon request, will provide reasonable accommodation to ensure equal access to these programs, services, and activities. Sign language interpreters, assistive listening devices, or other auxiliary aids and/or other services may be provided upon request. To ensure availability of services, please make your request no later than three working days (72 hours) prior to the meeting by calling the Commission Secretariat at 213/978-1300.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>STAFF REPORT</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>INITIATION</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>BACKGROUND</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>DISCUSSION</b>	<b>5</b>
Benefits of Flexible and Reduced Parking	<b>5</b>
Modified Parking Requirement District	<b>6</b>
1. Change of Use Parking Standards	<b>7</b>
2. Off-site Parking	<b>8</b>
3. Parking Reduction Permit	<b>9</b>
4. Decreased Parking Requirements	<b>9</b>
5. Increased Parking Requirements	<b>10</b>
6. Commercial Parking Credits	<b>10</b>
7. Maximum Parking Limits	<b>10</b>
Outreach and Staff Hearing	<b>11</b>
<b>CONCLUSION</b>	<b>13</b>

### ATTACHMENTS:

**APPENDIX B – PROPOSED ORDINANCE**

**ATTACHMENT 1 – FINDINGS**

**ATTACHMENT 2 – NEGATIVE DECLARATION**



## **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

Appendix B proposes a new multi-faceted Modified Parking Requirement (MPR) District that enhances the City's ability to develop parking strategies that are tailored to the unique circumstances of individual communities. The MPR District will offer seven parking strategies and tools to be included, individually or in combination, for each district: 1) change of use parking standards; 2) use of a Parking Reduction Permit; 3) off-site parking for all uses within 1500 feet; 4) decreased parking standards; 5) increased parking standards; 6) commercial parking credits; and 7) maximum parking requirements.

The proposed ordinance (Appendix B) is recommended to replace a previously proposed ordinance (Appendix A) approved by the City Planning Commission (CPC) on August 9, 2007. That proposed ordinance (Appendix A) recommended that applications for residential parking reductions be considered through a Zoning Administrator Determination rather than a Zone Variance when Transportation Demand Measures (TDMs) are incorporated into the project. Issues raised during the public hearings included the possibility that reduced parking for guests and patrons of retail establishments would create spillover parking impacts in single-family neighborhoods and increased competition for parking among uses in commercial districts.

The Department believes that the parking strategies in this new, proposed ordinance (Appendix B) allow carefully selected areas to benefit from modified parking requirements while protecting neighborhoods from spillover parking impacts. These benefits could include encouraging transit use and pedestrian activity in areas well served by transit, reducing housing costs and enhancing housing options by not requiring unneeded parking, increased open space and other amenities provided on land or floor area not dedicated for parking, improved urban design, and environmental and public health benefits from reducing reliance on the single-occupancy automobile.

## **STAFF REPORT**

### **INITIATION**

The proposed ordinance (Appendix B) is a substantial revision to a previously proposed ordinance (Appendix A) that recommended that residential parking reductions be sought through the Further Authority of the Zoning Administrator when TDMs, such as designated vanpool/carpool parking areas, are incorporated into projects. That proposal simply added residential uses to an already existing zoning code provision that allows commercial and manufacturing project applicants to seek parking reductions when TDMs are incorporated into such projects. The proposed ordinance also responds to a motion introduced by Councilmembers Hahn and LaBonge instructed the Chief Legislative Analyst's (CLA) Office to report on the feasibility of creating a public transit fund with fees paid by recipients of parking reductions.



## BACKGROUND

The proposed ordinance (Appendix B) furthers the Department's commitment to making the City more sustainable and pedestrian-friendly. Development of off-street parking requirements that are tailored to the unique circumstances of individual districts, particularly areas that are well-served by transit and offer transportation alternatives, will encourage multi-modal means of transportation, decrease dependence on automobiles, and alleviate the City's and the region's traffic congestion. The Department also believes that the proposed ordinance (Appendix B) will contribute to the City's efforts to increase production of moderately-priced multi-family housing while providing adequate protection to our single-family neighborhoods. Alternatively, the proposed ordinance could allow parking increases in areas where parking is insufficient to meet demand and/or public transit access is limited.

The City Planning Commission (CPC) heard and approved a previously proposed ordinance (Appendix A) on August 9, 2007. That proposed ordinance would have enhanced the authority of the Zoning Administrator to reduce on-site parking from that otherwise required by the LAMC. The ordinance was heard by the Planning and Land Use Management (PLUM) Committee on October 16, 2007. Due to a split vote, the matter was forwarded to the full City Council without a committee recommendation. The City Council heard the item on November 27, 2007, at which time Councilmembers Hahn and LaBonge introduced a related motion (CF 07-2991-S1) that instructed the Chief Legislative Analyst's (CLA) Office to report on the feasibility of creating a public transit fund with fees paid by applicants that received reduced parking approvals. Both matters, the previously proposed ordinance and the new motion, were referred to the Transportation Committee and then subsequently referred back to the City Planning Commission for further analysis. This report addresses the motion and is a substantial modification to the previously discussed proposed parking ordinance (Appendix A).

The Hahn-LaBonge motion introduced the concept of a public transit fund that would be financed through fees paid by land use applicants whose projects were granted parking reductions. The motion recommended a fee of "about \$30,000" per vehicle parking space reduction, based on an estimated cost of constructing one parking space. The fund would be used to enhance public transportation in the City to reduce the need to use personal vehicles. This proposal was initiated in response to public testimony that argued that the City lacks a sufficient level of public transit that would justify any reduction in on-site parking. The CLA's Office, in conjunction with Planning Department staff, has determined that establishing such a fund and imposing such a fee is infeasible because the amount of fees generated would be nominal in comparison to transit operating costs, and establishing and monitoring the fund maintenance operation.

Supporters of the previously proposed ordinance (Appendix A) noted that requiring each new dwelling unit to provide on-site parking, residents must bear the cost of that parking, even if they do not need it. (For example, some people do not own cars and some cannot drive). When parking is bundled with housing, this encourages vehicle ownership and use. Allowing reductions in parking and thereby reducing vehicle use has other positive impacts, including reductions in greenhouse gases, reductions in traffic congestion, and



encouragement of pedestrian activity which enhances public health, including by reducing obesity levels.

Opponents of the previously-proposed ordinance raised concerns about the potential impact on single-family neighborhoods from nearby multi-family projects with reduced parking. Opposition by local leaders and members of the public focused on the perception that there is a shortage of parking for all land uses and belied that the City needs more, not less, vehicle parking. There was also concern expressed that residents of multi-family projects with reduced parking would encounter difficulties with daily errands and commuting. The revised proposed ordinance (Appendix B) addresses the concerns raised about the previously-proposed ordinance. In areas where parking is insufficient to meet demand and/or public transit access is limited, increases to standard parking requirements may be warranted. An increase in the number of required residential, commercial or manufacturing parking spaces will provide additional off-street parking to mitigate any shortage of on-street parking and address spillover impacts from new projects.

## **DISCUSSION**

### **Benefits of Flexible and Reduced Parking Requirements**

The general purpose of off-street parking requirements is to ensure that each land use provides sufficient parking to meet the demands of its occupants and customers. The City has established minimum parking standards for all land uses that apply citywide. However, these citywide standards may not be appropriate for all neighborhoods in the City. Some areas have high levels of transit use and/or other alternative transportation; less reliant on the automobile, they require less parking. In other areas that are well-served by transit, it may be desirable to encourage the creation of genuinely transit-oriented developments that are not automobile- and parking-oriented. Especially in denser areas with high land costs, the cost of providing parking increases the cost of housing, especially multifamily units.

Today, satisfying these parking requirements takes up valuable land and can significantly increase the cost of construction, which results in higher prices and rents. However, most parking is provided to the user at no charge or below cost, and the cost of parking is bundled with rent or the cost of goods and services. Because users of parking do not bear the full cost of that parking, they tend to drive more and use more parking than they otherwise would. In this way, the current parking requirements encourage automobile usage, resulting in increased traffic congestion, air pollution and generation of greenhouse gases.

In areas well-served by transit, reducing minimum parking requirements will help to create more livable communities. Auto-oriented uses that rely on high levels of parking would be discouraged from occupying land near rail and bus transit centers. Reducing the supply of free or subsidized parking discourages automobile use and thereby encourages transit use, bicycling, walking and alternative transportation measures such as carpooling and shared car programs. Reducing parking requirements near transit would provide an economic



advantage and incentive for genuinely transit- and pedestrian-oriented development.

A shift away from requiring each use to provide a dedicated supply of parking and toward a focus on parking that is publicly-available can encourage people to park once and walk from destination to destination, rather than driving short distances from parking lot to parking lot. In transit- and pedestrian-oriented areas (nearly all transit users are pedestrians at one or both ends of the transit trip), on-site parking requirements can lead to an urban form with large numbers of driveway entrances that make it uncomfortable and dangerous for pedestrians. Encouraging pedestrian activity yields important public health benefits in a City where obesity is a problem.

Requiring developers to provide large amounts of off-street parking significantly adds to the cost of new housing development, especially in denser parts of the City where land costs are high. Typically, the cost of parking is included in the home price or rent of a condominium or apartment, resulting in higher housing prices and rents. Structured parking in areas with high land costs can cost as much as \$30,000 per parking space. For a 2-bedroom condominium that requires 2.5 parking spaces, the cost of parking alone is \$75,000. Housing production--especially of moderately-priced and multifamily units-- has fallen dangerously far behind demand in Southern California. The cost of parking contributes to this shortfall.

Current parking requirements for housing do not necessarily reflect actual demand for parking. According to the United States Census Bureau, two-thirds of renter households in the City of Los Angeles have zero or one vehicles; just one-third have two or more vehicles.<sup>1</sup> Allowing the construction of housing with reduced parking requirements along transit lines would benefit moderate-income households. Because of transit access, they would have less need to own cars; because rents wouldn't have to include costs of excess parking, housing costs would be reduced. In conjunction with lower parking requirements, unbundling the cost of parking from housing costs allows off-street parking to be priced in response to the actual demand for parking, and requires consumers to pay the cost of their transportation choices. This provides a financial benefit to households that are less dependent on the automobile. In short, reducing off-street parking requirements in areas where options to automobile use exist encourages construction of moderately-priced housing in precisely the locations it is needed and desired.

### **Modified Parking Requirement (MPR) District**

The proposed ordinance (Appendix B) provides a new planning tool, the Modified Parking Requirement (MPR) District, for managing parking-specific concerns in designated areas. The MPR District ordinance authorizes the establishment of a MPR District with defined boundaries, and provides a menu of seven parking-related tools that can be individually selected based upon the parking needs of the district. The City has a wide diversity of neighborhoods with widely-varying levels of population and employment density, transit

---

<sup>1</sup> U.S. Census Bureau, 2007-09 American Community Survey, Table B25044



service and automobile dependence. Given the increasing complexity of the City's parking issues, a one-size-fits-all approach to parking requirements cannot meet the needs of each neighborhood. The proposed ordinance's "menu" format provides the flexibility necessary to tailor parking requirements to unique circumstances. Over the next several years, many parts of the City will enjoy increased transportation options, including through expansion of Metros' rail transit network and implementation of the new Bicycle Plan. This ordinance provides a tool for the City to adjust parking requirements in discrete areas as reliance on the automobile changes.

An MPR District may be established only if the City Council makes three findings. The Council must make the two existing findings for any legislative action: (1) that the District is consistent with the general plan and (2) that it is in conformity with public necessity, convenience, general welfare, and good zoning practice. Additionally, the proposed ordinance includes a finding that the strategies included in the MPR District are appropriate considering such factors as local transit dependency and automobile usage, traffic, available parking and level of transit service, and the goals, policies, and objectives set forth in the applicable community plan and specific plan.

Currently, the LAMC contains regulations for the establishment of a "Parking Restriction District" and a "Parking Reduction District" to provide increased and decreased parking standards, respectively, for designated areas. These two supplemental use districts will be included as tools in the proposed MPR District. However, the MPR goes beyond merely regulating the amount of parking, and includes strategies that increase flexibility about how required amounts of parking are provided. A varied menu of MPR strategies will allow planners to develop an approach using one or more of the seven specific tools that strategically addresses each community's specific parking situation. The strategies are listed below:

### **1. Change of Use Parking Standards**

This tool would allow changes to more parking-intensive uses, such as converting a retail use to a restaurant, without requiring additional off-street parking. This would promote economic development, and would be appropriate in areas with ample supplies of publicly-available parking or where spillover parking is not an important concern.

In denser commercial areas predominated by older buildings such as downtown and Hollywood, changes of use can be hampered by mandating current code required parking. Similarly, in older pedestrian-oriented commercial areas where there is a need and desire to preserve neighborhood character, such as Eagle Rock and Atwater Village, many existing uses have minimal on-site parking capacity with little or no room for expansion. This limits the types of new uses that can replace older ones, especially as the overall nature of commercial activity changes. This hinders the economic revitalization of areas and diminishes new investment. Currently, where a new restaurant is proposed for a retail space in an existing building with little or no parking, the project applicant must apply for a Zone Variance to request deviation from the existing parking requirements. The Zone Variance process can be lengthy, expensive and uncertain, which can deter desirable uses



from locating in older commercial districts. The Zone Variance process can be especially daunting for small, local businesses that most communities say they want to encourage.

In MPR Districts provided with the Change of Use Parking Standards management tool, a new use would not be required to provide additional off-street parking beyond the requirements for the existing use. This transfer of parking requirements would not allow the new use to reduce the existing number of legal on-site parking spaces. This tool would allow new businesses to open by right where previously they would have been precluded due to insufficient parking without obtaining a Zone Variance. It is anticipated that this tool would be utilized primarily in dense areas with ample transit opportunities or other transportation options, and/or areas with large supplies of publicly-available parking.

In sum, different parking requirements for different uses can be an obstacle to economic development when one type of business is being replaced by another. Grandfathering in the existing parking for a new use would alleviate this problem in areas where promoting economic development is desired.

## **2. Off-Site Parking for all uses within 1,500 feet**

This tool would allow off-site parking within 1500 feet of a use in an MPR District, instead of the 750 feet allowed for non-residential uses under the existing code. This tool will expand site design options in the City's most dense areas. This MPR strategy will most likely be utilized in denser areas where real estate is at premium and where it is often logistically and financially difficult to provide required on-site parking.

The LAMC currently prohibits by-right off-site parking for residential uses. This hinders the development of much needed housing throughout the City and discourages creative parking solutions, especially in dense residential areas. The LAMC allows by-right off-site parking for commercial and manufacturing uses up to 750 feet, but excludes residential uses from that benefit. By allowing off-site parking for residential uses within MPR Districts, the City will expand the locations where moderately-priced housing could be built at a time when potential housing sites are becoming exceedingly difficult to find.

This MPR tool will also expand the 750 foot off-site parking radius for commercial and industrial uses, extending the off-site distance to 1500 feet for any land use. Again, it can be reasonably expected that people will walk up to 1,500 feet for general convenience trips. Studies of pedestrian behavior indicate that this distance is about a 5-minute walk. The LAMC currently allows certain uses in the Downtown Business District to provide parking within this 1,500 foot distance. There are other parts of the City where the pattern of urban development and pedestrian activity is such that the 1,500 foot distance is appropriate, including in dense areas well-served by transit that already have high levels of pedestrian activity.

Increasing the off-site parking radius can provide an important economic development benefit. When people park off-site, they walk past other businesses on their way to their ultimate destination, and often stop and shop at these businesses. This "park once"



behavior enhances overall economic activity without increasing car trips. It encourages the development of complementary businesses, such as an art gallery near a restaurant with long waits for tables, or a coffee shop near a busy barber shop.

### **3. Parking Reduction Permit**

In MPR Districts that include this tool, any use that may warrant less than code-required parking could apply for a Parking Reduction Permit. This tool could be used in areas with ample transit and/or for individual projects that incorporate transportation alternatives. The Parking Reduction Permit allows project applicants to request reduced parking via a discretionary review that requires making findings that adequate alternatives to required parking exist. Such findings will allow the decision maker to base his decision to reduce parking on the actual facts applicable to the parcel or project.

The decision maker for this proposed Parking Reduction Permit will be either the Zoning Administrator or the decision maker for the lead case. Applicants for Parking Reduction Permits could request any amount of reduced parking, provided they demonstrate to the decision maker that the parking reduction is warranted due to an alternative transportation strategy incorporated into the proposed project.

In most areas of the City, a parking reduction requires a Zone Variance that mandates that hardship findings be made. This has resulted in challenges and appeals that increase the cost and uncertainty to the City, the applicant and nearby residents. In areas where it has been determined that less restrictive parking requirements are appropriate provided that transportation alternatives exist, a more appropriate process than the Zone Variance is warranted.

### **4. Decreased Parking Standards**

In areas where less parking is needed or public transit is being encouraged, decreases to standard parking requirements may be warranted. A reduction in the number of required residential, commercial or manufacturing parking spaces will provide flexibility in building design, maintain or enhance pedestrian-oriented urban design, and allow more efficient use of buildable land, which in turn reduces rents, including housing costs.. All modifications to LAMC parking requirements will be stated directly in the ordinance creating the Modified Parking Requirement District.

This tool would permit the continuation of parking reduction programs that had been offered in recently expired CRA districts to incentivize development.

### **5. Increased Parking Standards**

In areas where parking is insufficient to meet demand and/or public transit access is limited, increases to standard parking requirements may be warranted. An increase in the number of required residential, commercial or industrial parking spaces will provide additional off-street parking to mitigate any shortage of on-street parking and address



spillover impacts from new projects. All modifications to LAMC parking requirements will be stated directly in the ordinance creating the Modified Parking Requirement District.

## **6. Commercial Parking Credits**

Commercial Parking credits provide a tool for businesses to meet code-required parking requirements through underutilized publicly-owned or publicly-available on-street or off-street parking spaces. The number of credits and the time period(s) of their availability shall be based on a survey, which shall be approved by the Department of Transportation. The survey shall document the occupancy of all such spaces within the MPR District on an hourly basis between 8:00 am and 12:00 am for at least two weekdays and two weekend days, none of which is a holiday. Credits might be established separately for varying times of day. This tool enhances economic development by allowing changes of use by right, rather than through the Zone Variance process, in areas where it is demonstrated that adequate off-street parking exists.

## **7. Maximum Parking Requirements**

Many cities in the United States have begun to supplement minimum parking requirements with maximum parking requirements in an attempt to achieve balanced land use management. Maximum parking requirements limit the number of parking spaces a developer can provide. Instead of asking developers to provide *at least* a certain number of parking spaces, developers are now asked to provide *no more* than a certain number of parking spaces. It is anticipated that this strategy would be used in a TOD where transit is being encouraged, similar to the existing parking maximums required in the Vermont Western Station Neighborhood Area Plan (SNAP).

Large cities such as San Antonio, Seattle, San Francisco and Portland have maximum parking requirements. Portland's maximum parking requirements vary within the city, depending on the characteristics of different districts, and the distance of a land use from mass transit. Other cities, such as San Francisco and Seattle, apply maximum parking limits only to office buildings. Smaller municipalities such as Cambridge, Massachusetts; Redmond, Washington; Queen Cree, Arizona; and Concord, North Carolina are also implementing maximum parking requirements. The United Kingdom, which has a centralized system of urban planning, recently enacted a policy requiring every municipality to implement maximum parking requirements for retail stores, stadiums, office buildings, cinemas and conference centers that reach sizes above relevant thresholds (e.g. 30,000 square feet).

Maximum parking requirements work in the same way minimum parking requirements do. Depending on the proposed land use (e.g. office building, golf course, apartment building) there is a particular ratio of parking spaces allocated to the land use. For example, an office building might be limited to 2.5 parking spots per 1000 square feet of gross leasable area. The numerical limits set by municipalities for particular land uses usually come from either the parking generation manual published by the Institute of Transportation Engineers, and/or from limits other municipalities have instituted.



## Outreach and Staff Hearing

On March 30, 2011, the Planning Department held a public staff hearing on this matter. After a staff presentation of the proposed ordinance the floor was opened to a question and answer period. Following the question and answer period, the hearing officer opened the public hearing for testimony. There were 23 speakers, 18 in opposition and five in favor of the proposed ordinance.

Summary and staff responses to main concerns from the staff public hearing:

1. A three-acre minimum for an MPR District is too small.

Staff response: Three acres is a standard size for most supplemental use districts. An MPR District of this size could reasonably accommodate the implementation of commercial parking credits.

2. The creation of an MPR District is spot zoning.

Staff response: Spot zoning pertains to the zoning of a particular parcel that may be at odds with the surrounding zoning. The establishment of an MPR District must be consistent with the General Plan and good zoning practice.

3. This type of ordinance requires an EIR.

Staff response: Enabling legislation to allow changes in parking requirements does not change any parking requirements and a Negative Declaration is an adequate CEQA review. Each implementation ordinance will undergo its own environmental clearance.

4. There is inadequate transit to justify reductions in parking anywhere in the City.

Staff response: An MPR District to reduce parking requirements can be located in a Transit-Oriented District (TOD), where sufficient transit options can compensate for fewer required parking spaces.

5. Variances should be conducted on a case by case basis.

Staff response: Some areas may warrant less parking for all projects. In select areas, the City encourages the reduced parking and reliance on individual parking variances does not support that goal.

6. Studies should be required to implement an MPR.

Staff response: The establishment of an MPR District will require that the strategies included in the District are appropriate considering such factors as local transit dependency and automobile usage, traffic, available parking, and

lever of transit service, and the goals, policies, and objectives set forth in the applicable community plan.

7. Parking requirements are already too low.

Staff response: Excessive parking requirements exacerbate the City's congestion and pollution problems. The availability of free or low-cost parking is a major deterrent to transit ridership.

8. The ordinance does not define "ample transit".

Staff response: Depending on which strategies are being implemented within an MPR District, "ample transit" would have to be justified on a case-by-case basis.

9. Off-site parking located 1500 feet from a project is too far to walk.

Staff response: A quarter mile is a standard distance for walking.

10. More municipal parking structures are needed.

Staff response: The Planning Department favors centralized parking facilities.

11. The City needs to increase parking requirements.

Staff response: Increasing parking requirements will only exacerbate the City's traffic and pollution problems.

12. MPR Districts should only be established during community plan updates.

Staff response: Establishing MPR Districts during community plan updates would be ideal but the City should retain the ability to establish an MPR District when a parking issue is identified.

13. MPR tools could be added to an existing MPR without review.

Staff response: The addition of optional parking tools to an existing MPR District is a legislative action that requires public notification and a public hearing.

14. The establishment of an MPR must require findings.

Staff response: All legislative actions are required to meet the General Plan and good zoning practice findings set forth in Section 12.32 C of the LAMC. Additionally, it must be found that the strategies included in the MPR District are appropriate considering such factors as local transit dependency and automobile usage, traffic, available parking, and lever of transit service, and the goals, policies, and objectives set forth in the applicable community plan.



## CONCLUSION

The City of Los Angeles regulates the number of parking spaces for all land uses with a one-size-fits-all standard. The proposed ordinance (Appendix B) amends the Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC) to provide a more responsive and practical means of parking management with a toolkit of options based on community-level qualities.

In areas with adequate transportation alternatives, the ordinance can accommodate a request for modified parking. Additionally, the proposed ordinance includes a tool for mitigating residential parking spillover induced by inadequate existing requirements. By expanding on developable land use options, the proposed amendment facilitates opportunities for additional or expanded open space, increased housing production and affordability, and multi-modal transportation options.

These modifications offer parking solutions that are a better fit to local transportation characteristics. The proposed ordinance does not reduce the number of parking spaces currently required for any land use and will not interfere with the City's efforts to preserve its single-family neighborhoods. Further, this amendment will not supersede any specific plan requirements or any rule set forth in a community plan. The proposed ordinance advances the City into a new stage of progressive land use management, which is consistent with the City Planning Commission policy of "Do Real Planning".



## ATTACHMENT 1

### LAND USE FINDINGS

The City Planning Department recommends that the City Planning Commission, in accordance with Charter Section 558, find:

1. In accordance with Charter Section 556, the proposed ordinance (Appendix B) is in substantial conformance with the purposes, intent and provisions of the General Plan in that it is in substantial conformance with the purposes, intent, and provisions of the Transportation Element of the City's General Plan. Appendix B implements Policy 2.24 of the Transportation Element by implementing shared-parking, peripheral parking, and parking-pricing strategies in high-employment areas; Policy 3.10 of the Transportation Element by developing new and refined parking policy procedures for designated centers and districts; Policy 3.11 of the Transportation Element by implementing transportation improvements and demand reduction programs to mitigate the circulation impacts attributable to new development in accordance with State nexus legislation and judicial findings; Policy 3.12 of the Transportation Element to promote transit access in neighborhood districts, community and regional centers, and along mixed-use boulevards; Policy 3.14 to promote shared-parking in appropriate centers and districts; and Policy 4.1 to minimize the intrusion of traffic generated by new regional or local development into residential neighborhoods while preserving an adequate collector street system; and

The proposed ordinance (Appendix B) will encourage the development of multiple-family housing at all income levels, a goal of the General Plan. Furthermore, this ordinance implements Framework Element, Objective 3.4.3, which states that the City must "[e]stablish incentives for the attraction of growth and development in the districts, centers, and mixed-use boulevards targeted for growth that may include ... [m]odified parking requirements in areas in proximity to transit or other standards that reduce the cost of development ..." Objective 4.4.1 states that the City must "[t]ake the following actions in order to increase housing production and capacity ... [s]treamline procedures for securing building permits, inspections, and other clearances needed to construct housing."; and

the proposed ordinance (Appendix B) will have no adverse effect upon the General Plan, specific plans, or any other plans being created by the Department of City Planning because the proposed ordinance is consistent with the General Plan and carries out the General Plan goals, policies and objectives discussed above. There will be no substantive changes made to the existing parking requirements established in the enabling legislation for the MPR District, therefore there will be no effects on any above-referenced plan; and



2. in accordance with Charter Section 558 (b)(2), the proposed ordinance (Appendix B) will be in conformity with public necessity, convenience, general welfare and good zoning practice in that it will allow the development of more housing by easing the process by which required parking spaces for residential uses can be reduced. Objective 4.1.8 of the General Plan Framework states that the City must “[c]reate incentives and reduce regulatory barriers in appropriate locations in order to promote the adaptive re-use of structures for housing and rehabilitation of existing units”; and in accordance with the City Planning Commission policy, “Do Real Planning”, the proposed ordinance (Appendix B) is in substantial conformance with the intent and purpose of item 12 to revisit our “one size fits all” suburban parking standards, and replace them with project and location-specific tools such as parking maximums, pooled parking, automated stacked parking, and other emerging techniques.

## ENVIRONMENTAL FINDING

In accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), a Negative Declaration (Attachment 2) was published on February 10, 2011. On all measures the proposed ordinance (Appendix B) will have either no or a less than significant effect on the environment. The proposed ordinance makes no changes to existing zoning, any specific plans or other land use regulations that affect the physical environment.



# **APPENDIX B:**

## **Proposed Ordinance**



## APPENDIX B

### PROPOSED ORDINANCE FOR DISCUSSION

A proposed ordinance amending Sections 12.04, 12.24, 12.32, 13.00 and adding Section 13.15 of the Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC) to create a Modified Parking Requirement (MPR) District offering eight optional parking requirement modification tools including (1) change of use parking standards, (2) use of a new Parking Reduction Permit, (3) off-site parking within 1500 feet, (4) decreased parking requirements, (5) increased parking requirements, (6) commercial parking credits, and (7) maximum parking requirements.

### THE PEOPLE OF THE CITY OF LOS ANGELES DO HEREBY ORDAIN AS FOLLOWS:

**Section 1.** Subsection D of Section 12.04 of the Los Angeles Municipal Code is amended to read:

**D.** Certain portions of the City are also designated as being in one or more of the following districts, by the provisions of Article 3 of this chapter.

"O"	Oil Drilling District
"S"	Animal Slaughtering
"G"	Surface Mining District
"RPD"	Residential Planned Development District
"K"	Equinekeeping District
"CA"	Commercial and Artcraft District
"POD"	Pedestrian Oriented District
"CDO"	Community Design Overlay District
"MU"	Mixed Use District
"FH"	Fence Height District
"SN"	Sign District
"RFA"	Residential Floor Area District
"NSO"	Neighborhood Stabilization Overlay District
"CPIO"	Community Plan Implementation Overlay District
"MPR"	<u>Modified Parking Requirement District</u>

The "**Zoning Map**" is amended to indicate these districts and the boundaries of each district.

Land classified in an "O" Oil Drilling District, "S" Animal Slaughtering District, "G" Surface Mining District, "RPD" Residential Planned Development District, "K" Equinekeeping District, "CA" Commercial and Artcraft District, "POD" Pedestrian Oriented District, "CDO" Community Design Overlay District, "MU" Mixed Use District, "FH" Fence Height District, "SN" Sign District, "RFA" Residential Floor Area District, or "NSO" Neighborhood Stabilization Overlay District, "CPIO" Community Plan Implementation Overlay District, or "MPR" Modified Parking Requirement District is also classified in one or more zones, and land classified in the "P" Automobile Parking Zone may also be classified in an "A" or "R" Zone.

These classifications are indicated on the “**Zoning Map**,” with a combination of symbols, e.g., **R2-2-O**, **C2-4-S**, **M1-3-G**, **M1-1-P** and **R2-O**, **C2-G**, etc., where height districts have not been established.

**Sec. 2.** New Subdivision 28 of Subsection X of Section 12.24 of the Los Angeles Municipal Code is added:

**28. Reduced Parking in a Modified Parking Requirement (MPR) District.** A Zoning Administrator may, upon application, permit a reduction in the number of off-street parking spaces required by Section 12.21A.4 for a project located within a Modified Parking Requirement (MPR) District as set forth in Section 13.15.

**Sec. 3.** Subsection K of Section 12.32 of the Los Angeles Municipal Code is deleted:

**~~K. Parking Restriction District.~~**

~~1. An area may be designated by the Council by ordinance adopted in the manner required for a change of zone or height district as a Parking Restrictions District and provide parking requirements more restrictive than those otherwise required in Paragraph 12.21 A 4 (c) of this Code for the same use, if it meets one or more of the following criteria. In adopting the ordinance the Council shall make the following findings:~~

~~(a) There is a lack of transit service; or~~

~~(b) There is a high potential for spillover parking impacts on adjacent residential areas; or~~

~~(c) There is a low probability that parking management programs, transportation demand management programs, or public parking facilities will be available.~~

~~2. The boundaries of the area shall be accurately defined as a Parking Standards District (PSD) by ordinance, adopted in the same manner as required for a change of zone or height district.~~

~~3. Within a Parking Standards District, the minimum or maximum spaces required for commercial uses and commercial uses within industrial buildings, shall be established in the text of the ordinance.~~

**Sec. 4.** Subsection L of Section 12.32 of the Los Angeles Municipal Code is deleted:

**~~L. Parking Reduction District.~~** ~~An area may be designated by the Council by ordinance as a Parking Reductions District and provide parking requirements less restrictive than those otherwise required in Paragraph 12.21 A 4 (c) of this Code for the same use. In adopting the ordinance the Council shall make the following findings:~~



~~1. A parking overflow impact on residential neighborhoods will not be created nor will traffic congestion increase; and~~

~~2. There exists a combination of parking management programs, transportation alternatives, or other infrastructure improvements, and commercial building access programs, along with a method for City monitoring and ensuring compliance therewith, that negate the need for higher parking requirements; and~~

~~3. Flexible transportation approaches and parking management programs instead of a higher number of fixed parking space requirements are more consistent with the region's air quality goals, community character and general plan of the area than the accommodation of additional automobiles.~~

**Sec. 5.** Subsection S of Section 12.32 of the Los Angeles Municipal Code is amended to read as follows:

**S. Supplemental Use Districts.**

**1. Establishment of Districts.**

(a) **Purpose.** The purpose of this article is to regulate and restrict the location of certain types of uses whose requirements are difficult to anticipate and cannot adequately be provided for in the **"Comprehensive Zoning Plan"**. These uses, the boundaries of the districts where they are permitted, the limitations governing their operations, and the procedure for the establishment of new districts, are provided for in this article. Except for the **"Supplemental Uses"** permitted by this article, all property within the districts hereby established is subject to the provisions of the **"Comprehensive Zoning Plan"**.

(b) **Districts.** In order to carry out the provisions of this article, the following districts are established:

"O"	Oil Drilling District
"S"	Animal Slaughtering District
"G"	Surface Mining District
"RPD"	Residential Planned Development District
"K"	Equinekeeping District
"CA"	Commercial and Artcraft District
"POD"	Pedestrian Oriented District
"CDO"	Community Design Overlay District
"MU"	Mixed Use District
"FH"	Fence Height District
"SN"	Sign District
"RFA"	Residential Floor Area District
"NSO"	Neighborhood Stabilization Overlay District
"CPIO"	Community Plan Implementation Overlay District

“MPR”Modified Parking Requirement District

These districts and their boundaries are shown on portions of the “Zoning Map” as provided for in Section 12.04 and made a part thereof by a combination of the zone and district symbols. This map and the notations, references and other information shown on it, which pertain to the boundaries of these districts are made a part of this article as if fully described here. Reference is hereby made to those maps, notations, references and other information for full particulars.

**Sec 6.** Article 3 of the Los Angeles Municipal Code is amended to read as follows:

## Section

- 13.01 “O” Oil Drilling Districts.
- 13.02 “S” Animal Slaughtering Districts.
- 13.03 “G” Surface Mining Operations Districts.
- 13.04 “RPD” Residential Planned Development Districts.
- 13.05 “K” Equinekeeping Districts.
- 13.06 Commercial and Artcraft Districts.
- 13.07 Pedestrian Oriented District.
- 13.08 “CDO” Community Design Overlay District.
- 13.09 Mixed Use District.
- 13.10 Fence Heights District.
- 13.11 “SN” Sign District.
- 13.12 “NSO” Neighborhood Stabilization Overlay District.
- 13.13 “RFA” Residential Floor Area District.
- 13.14 “CPIO” Community Plan Implementation Overlay District.
- 13.15 “MPR” Modified Parking Requirement District.
- ~~13.15~~ 13.16 Violation.

**Sec. 7.** Section 13.15 of the Los Angeles Municipal Code is added:

**13.15 MODIFIED PARKING REQUIREMENT (MPR) DISTRICT.**

**A. Purpose.** This section sets forth procedures and guidelines for the establishment of Modified Parking Requirement (MPR) Districts to supplement areas of the City that have been identified as having unique parking issues. Reducing parking and providing flexibility in the location of off-street parking will ease traffic congestion and enable more affordable housing. Each MPR District will be designated by the City Council by ordinance adopted in the manner required for a change of zone.

**B. Establishment of Districts.** The procedures set forth in Section 12.32 S of the code shall be followed to establish a Modified Parking Requirement (MPR) District. Within a MPR District, one or more of the strategies listed in Subsection D shall be clearly established within the text of the ordinance.



C. **Size and Boundaries.** An MPR District shall contain at least three acres in area and the boundaries shall be accurately defined by ordinance and adopted in the same manner as required for a change of zone or height district.

D. **Initiation.** Initiation or amendment of an MPR District may be at the request of a private applicant, the Director of Planning, the City Planning Commission, or City Council.

E. **Findings.** In addition to the findings set forth in Section 12.32 C-2, the City Planning Commission must find that the District, and the strategies included in the District, are appropriate considering such factors as local transit dependency and automobile usage, traffic, available parking, and lever of transit service, and the goals, policies, and objectives set forth in the applicable community plan.

F. **Optional Modified Parking Requirement (MPR) District Strategies.** One or more of the seven strategies listed in this subsection shall be enumerated in the MPR District.

1. **Change of Use Parking Standards.** The required number of parking spaces shall be the same as the number of spaces that existed on the site on the date the Parking Space Modification District is established.

2. **Off-site Parking.** The automobile parking spaces required by Section 12.21 A.4 shall be provided either on the same lot as the use for which they are intended to serve or on another lot within 1500 feet therefrom, guaranteed through a covenant agreement. The said distance is to be measured parallel to any street, alley, public walk, or private easement that allows public pedestrian travel from the parking area to the use it is to serve.

3. **Parking Reduction Permit.** A Parking Reduction Permit, per Section 12.24 X.28, may be initiated to request reductions in parking for individual projects.

4. **Decreased Parking Requirements.** Parking requirements may be less restrictive than those otherwise required in Paragraph 12.21 A 4 of this Code. Each use with modified parking requirements must be itemized with its new parking requirement within the MPR District; otherwise the number of spaces shall be governed by Section 12.21 A 4.

5. **Increased Parking Requirements.** Parking requirements may be more restrictive than those otherwise required in Paragraph 12.21 A.4 of this Code. Each use with modified parking requirements must be itemized with its new parking requirement within the MPR District; otherwise the number of spaces shall be governed by Section 12.21 A.4.

6. **Commercial Parking Credits.** Parking requirements may be satisfied by the purchase of parking credits. The number of available parking credits shall be established by a survey that denotes the number of underutilized public parking spaces available within the MPR at various times of the day. The parameters of which shall be delineated in the individual MPR District.

7. **Maximum Parking Requirements.** Maximum parking limits may be set. Each use with maximum parking requirements must be itemized with its new parking

requirement within the MPR District; otherwise the number of spaces shall be governed by Section 12.21 A.4.

**Sec. 7.** The City Clerk shall certify ...