

Fwd: Regarding Preferential Parking policy (Council File 15-0600-S62)

Gloria Pinon <gloria.pinon@lacity.org>

Tue, Apr 9, 2019 at 8:45 AM

To: Clerk - Public Use - Clerk Council and Public Services <Clerk.CPS@lacity.org>, Anna Martinez <anna.martinez@lacity.org>

----- Forwarded message -----

From: 'John Gonzales' via Clerk - CityClerk <cityclerk@lacity.org>

Date: Mon, Apr 8, 2019 at 11:18 PM

Subject: Regarding Preferential Parking policy (Council File 15-0600-S62)

To: <councilmember.harris-dawson@lacity.org>, <councilmember.wesson@lacity.org>, <councilmember.price@lacity.org>, <councilmember.blumenfield@lacity.org>, <councilmember.huizar@lacity.org>, <councilmember.ryu@lacity.org>, <councilmember.cedillo@lacity.org>, <councilmember.krekorian@lacity.org>, <councilmember.bonin@lacity.org>, <councilmember.martinez@lacity.org>, <councilmember.rodriquez@lacity.org>, <councilmember.buscaino@lacity.org>, <councilmember.smith@lacity.org>, <councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org>, <councilmember.koretz@lacity.org>

Cc: <johnvngon@icloud.com>, <cityclerk@lacity.org>

Councilmembers & Clerk,

Please accept the following for consideration, and addition to the Council File, for item 15-0600-S62 on behalf of the Baldwin Hills Estates Homeowner's Association (CD8). We represent approximately 3500 residents on the fringe of a TOC area. We hereby request that the City of Los Angeles make a provision to exclude TOC 4 buildings, which elect an incentive to provide ZERO parking, from eligibility to participate in Preferential Parking Districts. Allowing them to so participate will create an undue negative impact on the surrounding residents.

TOC 4 building may be granted large exception from established parking policy and elect to provide ZERO parking. The rationale for this exception is based upon proximity to transit and the assumption that these residents will utilize transit and thus not require on-site parking. According the developer of the property is granted reduced building costs and the residents of said buildings will receive reduced costs of residency as well.

It is not equitable for the elimination of parking requirements to simply result in the residents of these buildings parking on surrounding streets. Especially when density increases are also allowed exacerbating the problem. That results in a significant unmitigated negative impact on the surrounding area. One solution is quite simple, and consistent with the basis that these TOC4 residents will not have parking needs. They can be disallowed the right to park in surrounding Preferential a parking districts.

The City is apparently considering a past opinion of former Attorney General Harris as precedent in denying the ability to make such a change to Preferential Parking policy. However, while that ruling is similar, it is also different. The previous ruling referred to denying distinction between single-family, small multi-family, and large multi-family uses. In that case the uses are all simply variants of residential use compliant with coded parking standards. So they may not have a distinction in regard to parking provision and have no specific parking exceptions granted. That is NOT the case for TOC4 buildings which elect for zero parking, apply for valuable parking concessions based on an assumed reduced parking use, and ARE distinguishable from even other multi-family projects. TOC is an entirely different and new zoning planning/zoning provision, and TOC4 is the extreme. So there's a difference between a previous case comparing a single family home to an apartment, without the addition of TOC exceptions, and comparing the current condition where a TOC4 building is basically exempted from established parking code.

Regardless of the legal precedent at hand, in general, the City must take responsibility for the impacts manifested in policy changes like TOC. Despite a general concept of reduced automobile activity due to transit, parking remains an issue in affected neighborhoods. Without fine-tuning the impacts of TOC, the adoption of the included provisions may have long-term positive results, but also bring negative consequences to large segments of local vested citizens.

If the city is going to "sell" these stakeholders on concepts like smart increased density and reduced parking, then the city should be sure to also adopt accompanying provisions to minimize the negative consequences to those affected. The exclusion from Preferential Parking for TOC4 buildings is one such provision, and clearly consistent with what stakeholders are told about reduced parking load as a basis for TOC4.

Unfortunately, if transit and TOC are going to bring significant negative impacts to existing stakeholders, without protections

4/9/2019

City of Los Angeles Mail - Fwd: Regarding Preferential Parking policy (Council File 15-0600-S62)

those stakeholders will lessen support for TOC and even transit itself. If TOC actually increases local parking (and traffic) burden, it will not fulfill its promise. If common sense falls victim to legal inflexibility, then the policy/code needs reconsideration. So please continue the refinement of transit and TOC policy, to include address of the issues constituents have as a result of them.

Thank You,

John Gonzales
Vice President & Land Use Committee
Baldwin Hills Estates Homeowners Association
(323) 620-3966

Sent from my iPad

Sent from my iPad