FRANK T. MARTINEZ City Clerk

KAREN E. KALFAYAN Executive Officer

When making inquiries relative to this matter refer to File No.

07-2991

CITY OF LOS ANGELES

CALIFORNIA



ANTONIO R. VILLARAIGOSA MAYOR Office of the CITY CLERK Council and Public Services Room 395, City Hall Los Angeles, CA 90012 Council File Information - (213) 978-1043 General Information - (213) 978-1133 Fax: (213) 978-1040

CLAUDIA M. DUNN Chief, Council and Public Services Division www.cityclerk.lacity.org

November 28, 2007

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE

RE: AMENDING SECTION 12.24 OF THE LOS ANGELES MUNICIPAL CODE TO INCLUDE MULTIPLE-FAMILY RESIDENCES TO THE EXISTING "REDUCED ON-SITE PARKING/ TRANSPORTATION ALTERNATIVES AUTHORIZATION"

At the meeting of the Council held on November 27, 2007, the attached Committee report was REFERRED to

the TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE.

hanh & Marting

City Clerk jr

steno/072991a



FILE NO. 07-2991

Your

PLANNING AND LAND USE MANAGEMENT

Committee

reports as follows:

EXEMPTION AND PLANNING AND LAND USE MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE REPORT relative to a proposed Ordinance amending Section 12.24 of the Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC) to include multiple-family residences to the existing "reduced on-site parking/transportation alternatives authorization."

SUBMITS WITHOUT RECOMMENDATION, the recommendations of the City Planning Commission:

- FIND that this action is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), pursuant to Article II, Section 2, Subsection (m) of the City's CEQA Guidelines.
- 2. ADOPT the FINDINGS of the City Planning Commission as the Findings of Council.
- 3. INSTRUCT the City Attorney to prepare and present an Ordinance amending Section 12.24 of the LAMC to include multiple-family residences as an allowed use for reduced parking through the further authority of the Zoning Administrator when parking management alternatives are applied, and to further allow Metro transit riders to utilize project parking for access to rail and bus stations within 750 feet of a project. This proposed ordinance will also remove the maximum allowable parking reduction that can be requested under this provision.

Applicant: City of Los Angeles

CPC 2007-2216 CA

Fiscal Impact Statement: Neither the City Administrative Officer, nor the Chief Legislative Analyst has completed a financial analysis of this report.

<u>Community Impact Statement</u>: The Hollywood United Neighborhood Council (HUNC) opposes the Planning Department's proposal to decrease the number of parking spaces required for new apartment buildings that are within 750 feet of a bus or rail line. As has been detailed in recent investigations by the Los Angeles Times and LA Weekly, most residents of buildings near transportation lines own cars and use them. Reducing or eliminating requirements for parking spaces will lead to more cars competing for onstreet parking.

Additional Information: The City of Los Angeles should develop a realistic plan for onsite parking requirements by developers to be based on the actual usage of public transportation in Los Angeles and not the current method of extrapolating based on cities in the United States that have well-established and extensive public transportation systems, have a smaller defined city limits and do not have the existing severe lack of parking in the transportation corridor areas that already severely impact quality of life.

Summary:

At its meeting held on October 16, 2007, the Planning and Land Use Management (PLUM) Committee considered the City Planning Commission's report relative to a proposed Ordinance amending Section 12.24 of the LAMC include multiple-family residences to the existing "reduced on-site parking/transportation alternatives authorization."

This proposed ordinance will include multi-family residences as an allowed use for reduced parking through further authority of the Zoning Administrator when parking management alternatives are incorporated into a project such as vanpools, ample bicycle storage, and shared car programs. This ordinance, as proposed will also allow Metro transit riders to utilize parking in a project when accessing Metro stations within 750 feet of a project. In addition, the proposed ordinance will remove the maximum allowable reduction in parking that can be requested. The current LAMC requirement limits the reduction in parking to 40 percent of the requirement.

In addition, Planning staff (staff) provided a summary existing provisions, and proposed amendments to the ordinance. It was reported by staff that there will be no substantive changes to the existing parking requirements established in the LAMC, nor will the ordinance provide "by-right" authority. In addition, staff reported that the ordinance will amend the existing code that currently allows commercial and manufacturers projects to seek reduced parking through a public review process. Currently, the reduction for inclusion for multi-family residences, will require a finding during a variance process. Applicant's under the newly proposed ordinance must prove that sufficient on-site parking and transportation alternatives are incorporated into their multi-family project(s). Staff also noted that, it is envisioned that this action would be sought in transit oriented districts. It was further reported that, approximately ten meetings were held with homeowners groups relative to the proposed ordinance. It was also reported that in early July 2007, workshops were held. Staff reported that paying for parking construction for multi-family residential buildings is costly (estimated \$25,000 for subterranean parking). It was reported that parking construction cost could minimize how much housing can be built in the City.

Testimony was provided in opposition and in support of the proposed ordinance. Speakers in support reported that the ordinance would lessen the cost for multi-family projects to provide onsite parking. It was further suggested that the reduced construction cost could serve as an incentive for developers to provide affordable housing. Two other speakers reported that, in Manhattan (New York), the use alternative transportation has worked. These speakers reported on alternatives to driving. One speaker reported that he often rides his bicycle to and from various destinations in the City.

Those speaking in opposition reported the ordinance would further increase hardships in the City of finding adequate parking. A representative of South Valley Area Planning Commission and many speakers reported that the transit system in the City is not a convenient or easily accessible transportation system (e.g., routes, hours of operation). Other speakers stated difficultly with the current transportation system is especially true for seniors, the disabled, and for those who work at night. It further reported that the City of Los Angeles lacks the infrastructure which would make this proposal work (New York and San Francisco sited as samples of cities with alternative transportation and infrastructure). In addition, it was suggested that Los Angeles should not depend on public transportation to justify reductions in project parking.

The Chief Deputy of Council District Four, speaking on behalf of Councilmember Tom LaBonge reported that, in Council District Four, parking is a problem. She reported receiving an enormous amount of telephone calls and emails regarding the lack of parking. She further stated that the City needs to hold workshops with Neighborhood Councils and neighboring communities on request for reduced parking, and that these cases should be reviewed on a case-by-case basis. She reported that the off-site parking in her Council District is rarely available.

Councilmember Ed P. Reyes, Chair of the PLUM Committee, speaking in support of the ordinance, noted that approximately 60 percent of the residents in the City are renters. These renters generally live in older buildings, with a proportional number living in poverty. Councilmember Reyes suggested that in areas where older building exist, that Councilmembers may find some benefit in the flexibility of this proposed ordinance. The flexibility is that this ordinance will allow use for reduced parking requirement through the further authority of the Zoning Administrator. Councilmember Reyes further reported that this ordinance may allow Councilmembers to decide if reduced parking would work in their district. He reported that the proposed ordinance would also allow

Councilmembers an opportunity to decide if reduced parking may create an incentive for additional and/or affordable housing near transit oriented areas.

Councilmember Jack Weiss, Member of PLUM Committee reported that, "no one size fits all," and that there are portions of the City where the proposed ordinance would not work. He suggested that in Manhattan (New York), people use public transportation, as there is no place to park their cars, and/or parking is too expensive. Councilmember Weiss suggested that, the ordinance would likely cause drivers to park their vehicles in other areas in the neighborhood, creating parking shortages for that area. In addition, he reported that the proposed ordinance may create an increase in preferential parking district request. Councilmember Weiss stated he would not support the ordinance, as presently proposed. However, he added that he would be supportive of an alternative ordinance which would provide options for communities to take advantage of reduced parking where it geographically makes sense.

The two Committee members present at the meeting did not reach a consensus, as Councilmember Reyes, Chair of PLUM voted in support of the proposed ordinance, and Councilmember Weiss voted in opposition, as proposed. The third member Councilmember Jose Huizar was absent. The matter is hereby submitted for Council consideration.

Respectfully submitted,

PLANNING AND LAND USE MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

<u>MEMBER</u> <u>VOTE</u> REYES: YES HUIZAR: ABSENT WEISS: NO

NOV 0 7 2007 - Continued to November 21, 2007

NOV 21 2007-CONTINUED TO NOV. 27,2007

10-17-07 Attachment: Proposed Ordinance

#072991

BG

NOV 2 7 2007 - REFERRED TQ

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE