



Richard Williams <richard.williams@lacity.org>

Fwd: NRDC supports AB 744 - Reduced Parking

Richard Williams <richard.williams@lacity.org>
To: Richard Williams <richard.williams@lacity.org>

Wed, Aug 19, 2015 at 6:40 AM

From: Cazares, Fernando
Sent: Monday, August 17, 2015 6:42 PM
Subject: NRDC supports AB 744 - Reduced Parking

Hello Mr. Westhall –

I stopped by your office today and dropped off the attached documents along with my business card for your consideration. We are supporting AB 744 which would allow a developer that is requesting a density bonus and including 100% affordable rental units in the development to also request that the city or county reduce the minimum parking requirements for the development. In order to petition this reduction, the development would have to be a within one-half mile of a major transit stop, a seniors-only development, or a development that serves special needs individuals.

We understand that Council member Krekorian introduced a resolution to oppose AB 744 and it was forwarded to the rules committee. I wanted to record our support for AB 744, in that we view it as an important step forward to increase housing affordability by lowering minimum parking requirements for housing developments that house populations whose limited incomes and physical challenges often prevent them from owning a car. Additionally, by targeting this reduced parking opportunity to developments within half a mile from transit, we are advancing the goals of SB 375, the Sustainable Communities and Climate Protection Act of 2008, which aims to integrate transportation and housing so that Californians don't have to travel alone in cars.

I would be glad to speak with you at your convenience and please don't hesitate to send your questions.

Best regards,

FERNANDO CÁZARES

*LA Regional Coordinator-Urban Solutions
CA Policy Advocate*

NATURAL RESOURCES

DEFENSE COUNCIL

1314 SECOND STREET

SANTA MONICA, CA 90401

T 310.434.2300

<http://www.nrdc.org/urbansolutions/>

FCAZARES@NRDC.ORG

NRDC.ORG

Please save paper.

Think before printing.

4 attachments



AB 744 Fact Sheet_07 20 15.docx
42K



AB_744_Amends_07142015.doc
33K



APA_Support_AB_744_July_14.pdf
156K



AB 744 NRDC Support 5.26.15.pdf
90K



Assembly Bill (AB) 744: Density Bonus

SUMMARY

AB 744 would allow a developer that is requesting a density bonus and including 100% affordable rental units in the development to also request that the city or county reduce the minimum parking requirements for the development. To qualify, the development would have to be a within one-half mile of a major transit stop, a seniors-only development, or a development that serves special needs individuals. For mixed income developments within one-half mile of a major transit stop that include the maximum number of very low- or low-income units under Density Bonus Law the parking requirement cannot exceed 0.5 per bedroom.

Local governments could require a higher parking standard if they completed a parking study in the last seven years that supports the need for more parking.

AB 744 PROMOTES AFFORDABLE HOUSING

- Enables developers to invest in building more affordable dwelling units and not waste public subsidies on unneeded parking spaces.
- Provides developers flexibility to include as much parking as necessary to meet actual demand.
- Reduces construction costs and encourages building of urban infill, transit oriented development, senior and special needs housing.
- AB 744 preserves a city's right to establish parking standards suitable to their specific circumstances.

BACKGROUND

Existing parking standards are out of synch with the State's policies to encourage urban infill development and impede construction of affordable housing and transit-oriented projects. AB 744 is a timely urban planning solution that will encourage construction of affordable housing, promote economic development and job growth, and reinforce California's competitions for federal transportation dollars.

AB 32: The California Global Solutions Act of 2006 requires California to reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions to 1990 levels by 2020. SB 375 (Steinberg) (2008) supports the State's climate action goals to reduce GHG emissions through coordinated transportation and land use planning with the goal of more sustainable communities. A key component of reducing GHG emissions is moving people out of their cars and onto public transit. Cities and counties are required to adopt sustainable community strategies (SCS) to show how development will support reduction in GHG emissions. Some cities and counties have adopted policies like eliminating minimum parking requirements for projects that are close to transit and where demand for parking spaces is low.

In some cases, cities and counties apply minimum parking standards to housing developments that do not reflect the demand from tenants for parking. These projects may be close to transit stations or home to seniors or individuals with special needs who drive less frequently and have fewer vehicles. Parking spaces, which sometimes go unused, can significantly increase the cost of construction. Certain types of parking, podium or subterranean, can increase parking costs by 6% or more relative to other types of parking. In cases where projects are 100% affordable or include affordable units,



Assembly Bill (AB) 744: Density Bonus

parking spaces needlessly drive up the cost of the project.

Under existing law, developers can request a density bonus if they include very low, low- or moderate-income units in their development. In return for the inclusion of affordable units, the developer receives an increase in density beyond the city's maximum and can request incentives and concessions for the development.

AB 744 aligns local land use decisions more closely with the goals of AB 32 and SB 375 by reducing the parking required for projects that are close to transit or serve individuals who have fewer cars.

PROPOSAL

AB 744 would allow a developer that is requesting a density bonus and including affordable units in the development to also request that the city reduce the minimum parking requirements for the development as follows:

- For 100% affordable projects:
 - For projects within ½ mile of a major transit stop, the parking requirement cannot exceed 0.5 per unit.
 - For seniors-only projects with access to transit, the parking requirement cannot exceed 0.5 per unit.
 - For special needs projects with access to transit, the parking requirement cannot exceed 0.3 per unit.
- For mixed income developments within ½ mile of a major transit stop that include the maximum number of very low- or low-income units under Density Bonus Law the parking requirement cannot exceed 0.5 per bedroom.

Local governments could require a higher parking standard if they completed a parking study in the

last seven years that supports the need for more parking.

BILL STATUS

Senate – In Committee Process – Appropriations

SUPPORT

- AARP
- American Planning Association, California Chapter
- Association of Regional Center Agencies (ARCA)
- Blaydes & Associates
- California Apartment Association
- California Association of Local Housing Finance Agencies (CAL-ALHFA)
- California Association of Housing Authorities (CAHA)
- California Bicycle Coalition
- California Council for Affordable Housing
- California Economic Summit
- California Housing Consortium
- California Housing Partnership Corporation
- California League of Conservation Voters
- California Rural Legal Assistance Foundation
- California State Treasurer, John Chiang
- Circulate San Diego
- City of Richmond, California
- Council of Infill Builders
- Councilmember Dominic Farinha, City of Patterson
- Councilmember Jake McKenzie, City of Rohnert Park
- Councilmember Pam O'Connor, City of Santa Monica
- Councilmember Steve Hansen, City of Sacramento
- Councilmember Wendy Thomas, City of Placerville
- Councilwoman Michelle Martinez, City of Santa Ana
- Domus Development
- Donald C. Shoup, Professor of Urban Planning, UCLA Luskin School of Public Affairs
- Eden Housing



Assembly Bill (AB) 744: Density Bonus

EAH Housing
 Enterprise Community Partners
 Greenbelt Alliance
 Habitat for Humanity Greater San Francisco
 Housing Authority of the City of Alameda
 Housing California
 Housing Leadership Council of San Mateo County
 Kate Meis, Executive Director, Local Government
 Commission
 LifeSTEPS
 LINC Housing
 Local Government Commission
 Lyft, Inc.
 Mayor Ed Lee, City of San Francisco
 Mayor Libby Schaaf, City of Oakland
 Mayor Pro Tem Jon Harrison, City of Redlands
 Mayor Tom Butt, City of Richmond
 Mercy Housing California
 Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC)
 Michael Lane, Policy Director, Non-Profit Housing
 Association of Northern California
 National Community Renaissance (CORE)
 Natural Recourses Defense Council (NRDC)
 Nelson\Nygaard
 Non-Profit Housing Association of Northern
 California (NHP)
 Rebecca J. Garcia, Councilmember, City of
 Watsonville
 Sacramento Housing Alliance
 San Diego Housing Federation
 San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District
 (BART)
 Satellite Affordable Housing Associates (SAHA)
 Southern California Association of NonProfit
 Housing (SCANPH)
 Supervisor Leticia Perez, Kern County
 Tenderloin Neighborhood Development
 Corporation
 Transform
 USGBC California
 Valley Industry and Commerce Association (VICA)
 Western Center on Law & Poverty
 9 individuals

City of Brentwood
 City of Camarillo
 City of Chino Hills
 City of Colton
 City of Concord
 City of Encinitas
 City of Glendale
 City of Highland
 City of Lakewood
 City of Lomita
 City of Palmdale
 City of Rocklin
 City of San Rafael
 City of Walnut Creek
 City of Whittier
 County of Los Angeles
 League of California Cities (Oppose Unless
 Amended)
 Marin County Council of Mayors and Council
 Members (MCCMC)

FOR MORE INFORMATION

Rebecca Rabovsky
 Consultant
 Assembly Committee on Housing and Community
 Development
 (916) 319-2085
 Rebecca.rabovsky@asm.ca.gov

OPPOSITION

AB 744 (Chau)

Amendments are **bolded and underlined**

(p) (1) ~~Upon~~ *Except as provided in paragraphs (2) and (3), upon* the request of the developer, ~~no~~ a city, county, or city and county shall *not* require a vehicular parking ratio, inclusive of handicapped and guest parking, of a development meeting the criteria of ~~subdivision (b); subdivisions (b) and (c),~~ that exceeds the following ratios:

(A) Zero to one bedroom: one onsite parking space.

(B) Two to three bedrooms: two onsite parking spaces.

(C) Four and more bedrooms: two and one-half parking spaces.

(2) Notwithstanding paragraph (1), if a development includes the maximum percentage of low- or very low income units provided for in paragraphs (1) and (2) of subdivision (f) and is located within one-half mile of a major transit stop, as defined in subdivision (b) of Section 21155 of the Public Resources Code, and there is unobstructed access to the major transit stop from the development, then, upon the request of the developer, a city, county, or city and county shall not impose a vehicular parking ratio, inclusive of handicapped and guest parking, that exceeds 0.5 spaces per bedroom.

For purposes of this subdivision, a development shall have unobstructed access to a transit stop if a resident is able to access the transit stop without encountering natural or constructed impediments.

(3) Notwithstanding paragraph (1), if a development consists solely of rental units, exclusive of a manager's unit or units, with an affordable housing cost to lower income families, as provided in Section 50052.5 of the Health and Safety Code, then, upon the request of the developer, a city, county, or city and county shall not impose a vehicular parking ratio, inclusive of handicapped and guest parking, that exceeds the following ratios:

(A) If the development is located within one-half mile of a major transit stop, as defined in subdivision (b) of Section 21155 of the Public Resources Code, and there is unobstructed access to the major transit stop from the development, the ratio shall not exceed 0.5 spaces per unit.

For purposes of this paragraph, a development shall have unobstructed access to the major transit stop if a resident is able to access the major transit stop without encountering natural or constructed impediments.

*(B) If the development is a for-rent housing development for individuals who are 62 years of age or older that complies with Sections 51.2 and 51.3 of the Civil Code, the ratio shall not exceed 0.5 spaces per unit. The development shall have either paratransit service or ~~be~~ **have unobstructed access** ~~located,~~ within one-half mile, ~~of~~ **to** fixed bus route service that operates at least eight times per day.*

(C) If the development is a special needs housing development, as defined in Section 51312 of the Health and Safety Code, the ratio shall not exceed 0.3 spaces per unit. The development shall

~~have either paratransit service or be~~ **have unobstructed access** ~~located, within one-half mile, of~~
to fixed bus route service that operates at least eight times per day.

~~(2)~~ (4) 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. For purposes of this subdivision, a development may provide ~~“onsite parking”~~ *on-site parking* through tandem parking or uncovered parking, but not through ~~onstreet~~ *on-street* parking.

~~(3)~~ (5) This subdivision shall apply to a development that meets the requirements of ~~subdivision~~ *subdivisions* (b) and (c), but only at the request of the applicant. An applicant may request parking incentives or concessions beyond those provided in this subdivision pursuant to subdivision (d).

(6) *This subdivision does not preclude a city, county, or city and county from reducing or eliminating a parking requirement for development projects of any type in any location.*

(7) *Notwithstanding paragraphs (2) and (3), if a city, county or city and county **or an independent consultant** has conducted an area-wide or jurisdiction-wide parking study in the last seven years, then the city, county, or city and county may impose a higher vehicular parking ratio not to exceed the ratio described in paragraph (1), based upon substantial evidence found in the parking study ~~conducted by an independent consultant~~, that includes, but is not limited to, an analysis of parking availability, differing levels of transit access, walkability access to transit services, the potential for shared parking, **and the effect of parking requirements on the cost of market-rate and subsidized development, and the lower rates of car ownership for low- and very-low- income individuals, including seniors and special needs individuals. for which the project occupancy is deed restricted, and the unique age or special needs of the residents. Any new study shall be paid for by the city, county, or city and county. The city, county, or city and county shall make findings supporting the need for the higher parking ratio. shall find that a higher parking ratio is required based on a parking study completed in conformance with this subparagraph.***

SEC. 3.

~~If the Commission on State Mandates determines that this act contains costs mandated by the state, reimbursement to local agencies and school districts for those costs shall be made pursuant to Part 7 (commencing with Section 17500) of Division 4 of Title 2 of the Government Code. **No reimbursement is required by the act pursuant to Section 6 of Article XIII B of the California Constitution because a local agency or school district has the authority to levy service charges, fees, or assessments sufficient to pay for the program or level of service mandated by the act, within the meaning of Section 17556 of the Government Code.**~~



American Planning Association
California Chapter

Making Great Communities Happen

July 14, 2015

Assembly Member Ed Chau, Chair
Assembly Housing & Community Development Committee
Room 2179, State Capitol
Sacramento, California 95814

**SUBJECT: SUPPORT FOR AB 744 (CHAU) AS AMENDED – PARKING
 REQUIREMENT REDUCTIONS FOR AFFORDABLE
 HOUSING PROJECTS NEAR TRANSIT**

The American Planning Association, California Chapter (APA California) is pleased to fully support AB 744 as amended, your measure that would specify minimum parking space baselines for affordable housing projects.

The bill as recently amended addressed our original concerns, and now strikes a balance by providing for substantially reduced parking requirements to encourage affordable, infill housing near active transit -- without overburdening surrounding developments with spillover parking. We appreciate your personal willingness to work with APA on this important measure, as well as the time and commitment of your staff and the sponsors.

If you have any questions, please contact Sande George with Stefan/George Associates, APA California's lobbyist, at 916-443-5301, sgeorge@stefangeorge.com.

Sincerely,

John Terell

John Terell, AICP
Vice President Policy and Legislation - APA California
jcterell@aol.com

cc: Governor's Office
 Republican Caucus
 Office of Planning & Research



May 26, 2015

Assembly Member Chau
State Capitol, Room 2179
Sacramento, CA 95814

Re: AB 744 (Chau) Reform Parking Regulations - SUPPORT

Dear Assembly Member Chau:

On behalf of Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC), which has 2.4 million members and activists, more than 380,000 of whom are Californians, we are writing to register our support for your bill, AB 744, which would reform parking regulations to improve housing affordability and help the state meet its climate goals. AB 744 takes an important step towards greater parking reform by reducing parking requirements for special needs, senior, and transit-oriented housing.

Minimum parking requirements greatly inflate development costs. According to a 2012 study, simply constructing one structured parking space costs \$27,000 in Los Angeles, not including the cost of land. In Oakland, researchers found that parking requirements resulted in an 18% increase in construction costs. This cost is bundled into the cost of the housing and is passed onto the resident, whether or not they use the parking. For example, for an apartment that rents for about \$800 without parking, a developer would have to increase rent by 50% just to have one surface parking space pencil-out.

Parking reform will not only help address housing affordability, it will help the state meet its climate, clean energy, and petroleum reduction goals. Currently, parking requirements are set by local planners based on an antiquated system of estimating average parking demand. Often, these requirements are much higher than needed. For example, of the 20,000 households added to Los Angeles between 2005 and 2011, 40% do not own any cars. Yet, the minimum parking requirement in L.A. is 1.5 spaces for a market-rate 1 bedroom and 1 space for an affordable unit. Requiring a surplus of parking encourages driving, requiring costly automobile ownership and directly contradicting the state's goals to reduce petroleum consumption and improve air quality.

In addition, reforming parking requirements will spur further development by freeing up space that would otherwise be wasted on empty parking spaces. Better utilizing land near transit will increase affordability and walkability, reduce greenhouse gas emissions, and benefit the local economy.

AB 744 provides needed reform but only to a limited set of projects. To decrease development costs, increase housing options, and encourage sustainable communities, we support eventual parking reform for all projects, including market-rate residential development and commercial development. For these reasons, NRDC supported AB 710 (Skinner) in 2011. Nothing in AB 744

NATURAL RESOURCES DEFENSE COUNCIL

1314 2ND STREET | SANTA MONICA, CA | 90401 | T 310.434.2300 | F 310.434.2399 | NRDC.ORG

should preclude cities or the state from pursuing further parking reform.

For these reasons, NRDC supports AB 744 as an important step in improving California's land use and transportation policies.

We thank you for your leadership on this important issue.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "A. Eaken", written in a cursive style.

Amanda Eaken
Deputy Director, Urban Solutions

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "Victoria Rome", written in a cursive style.

Victoria Rome
California Legislative Director