



John White <john.white@lacity.org>

RE:comment on CF10-1673 / Transportation Committee 7/27/11 Meeting / Apron Parking

1 message

Christopher McKinnon <chrispm@afewgoodideas.com>

Tue, Jul 26, 2011 at 5:11 PM

To: john.white@lacity.org

Cc: councilmember.labonge@lacity.org, Councilmember Richard Alarcon <councilmember.alarcon@lacity.org>, Paul Koretz - cd 5 <paul.koretz@lacity.org>, Councilmember Bernard Parks <councilmember.parks@lacity.org>

Dear Councilmembers, Legislative Assistant and staff,

I understand that the Wednesday 7/27/11 Transportation Committee will be meeting to discuss Council File 10-1673 which discusses street parking in front of driveways.

As an alternative for those City of Los Angeles residents and businesses that enjoy and have parked safely on their long aprons for generations, I have submitted to the Chairman, my councilmember, Bill Rosendahl the following wording for a motion to change the L.A.M.C. which I believe, and could be confirmed by the City Attorney and the California Attorney General, does not conflict with the California Vehicle Code or any ADA requirements.

Please consider the following amendment (in red) at the appropriate time to the

Los Angeles Municipal Code - Chapter VIII Traffic Section 80.00 Division "N" Parking Prohibited or Limited
SEC. 80.53. STANDING IN PARKWAYS PROHIBITED. No person shall stop, stand or park a vehicle within any parkway, except in a permitted driveway apron whose length is such that the vehicle stopped, standing or parked does not encroach on the sidewalk or the street including the convenience strip.

(Definitions (h) "Parkway" shall mean that portion of a street other than a roadway or a sidewalk.)

I have read the California Vehicle Code section 22500 and I see no conflict with my proposed amendment to the LAMC.

In the CVC Section 22500

"(e) In front of a public or private driveway, except that a bus engaged as a common carrier, schoolbus, or a taxicab may stop to load or unload passengers when authorized by local authorities pursuant to an ordinance."

This section (e) it does mention "In front of a public or private driveway" Driveway apron parking is not "in front of" it is IN the driveway. It is clear to me that the CVC intends "in front of" to mean in the roadway as it mentions exceptions like dropping off by schoolbus and taxicab:

I have also read section (l) of CVC 22500

"(l) In front of or upon that portion of a curb that has been cut down, lowered, or constructed to provide wheelchair accessibility to the sidewalk."

A. The "curb" was not lowered to "provide wheelchair accessibility to the sidewalk" as was required by ADA when all the curbs of the sidewalks at street crossings were lowered. It was "constructed" to allow property owner access to their driveway in the 1920's well prior to any ADA requirements.

B. Vehicles in a long enough driveway apron are not "in front of or upon that portion of the curb" anyway they are on level ground well out of range of the "lowered" portion or convenience strip width. Again I would contend "in front of" refers to the roadway not the driveway apron. And again I refer to my point A which takes precedence.

I also see no conflict with ADA requirements or ACLU requests as vehicles safely parked in the driveway apron in the Mar Vista Oval and other parts of the city do not impede pedestrian or wheelchair or vehicle flow. If needed I can send a picture of my car safely parked in the apron.

I hope some clarity comes from the City Attorney and if necessary a change in his interpretation and I look forward to introduction of a council motion to amend the LAMC soon thereafter.

Sincerely,

Christopher McKinnon
11837 North Park Avenue
Los Angeles, CA 90066
310-572-7929
213-494-7404 cell
chrispm@afewgoodideas.com

**Westwood South of Santa Monica Blvd
Homeowner's Association**
Incorporated November 8, 1971
P. O. Box 64213
Los Angeles, CA 90064-0213

July 26, 2011

LA City Council Transportation Committee
Councilmember Bill Rosendahl, Chair
Councilmembers Tom LaBonge, Richard Alarcon,
Paul Koretz, Bernard C. Parks - Members
City Hall, Los Angeles, CA 90012
Via email: John A. White, Legislative Assistant – john.white@lacity.org

RE: Council File: 10-1673

Dear Honorable Councilmembers:

Residents in our community have been very negatively impacted by recent City enforcement against apron parking. This enforcement has hurt single family homeowners, apartment owners and residents of affordable multi-family units. While the media have portrayed this issue to be one affecting only UCLA students in Westwood Village who park in driveway aprons blocking sidewalks and/or streets, the situation in our community, is considerably different. Residents in our community who park on aprons do so without blocking or encroaching upon sidewalks or the street. We agree with City enforcement of those who impede access of pedestrians – disabled and able-bodied alike. However, we do not understand why the City has enforced a “one size fits all” approach to a problem primarily in Westwood Village and have launched a campaign against other residents – many of whom have been ticketed with NO advance warning.

While we write today in support of Council File 10-1673, which provides a new approach to addressing parking shortfalls in residential areas, we also seek the Transportation Committee's support of new language to revise the Municipal Code to allow for apron parking that does not violate ADA. While we support CF 10-1673, sadly, it will be of little help to the many multi-family dwellings that have recently become the target of DOT/City enforcement against apron parking. Parking across driveways will block access to garages that need to be accessed by other tenants. The blocking of driveways will also create problems for service vehicles such as gardeners who also rely on the aprons for access to their jobs.

Residents in our community, which lies considerably south of the Westwood Village area, live in buildings that have large driveway aprons that can be easily and safely used for parking --- WITHOUT creating obstacles for pedestrians whether disabled or able-bodied. And, in fact, the recent enforcement has created access problems for disabled residents who are no longer able to easily access their homes or vehicles. Apartment owners complain that this enforcement will have impacts similar to a taking of property values as they will no longer be able to offer adequate parking with their rental units. Public safety has been compromised through the enforcement of the ban on apron parking. Residents must walk long distances, often at night to park. Crossing Beverly Glen Blvd., a four lane roadway with speeding cars and no traffic signals between the major arterials, is a dangerous proposition. Our apartment community on Beverly Glen Blvd. consists of many long-time residents, couples and families who have but one garage parking space for their apartment homes. We are not talking about landlords or buildings where garage spaces or apron spots are rented out separately from the residential units. There is little curb space for street parking due to the wide aprons fronting the apartment buildings (and most street parking spaces are used during daytime hours by Century City commuters seeking non-garage parking).

We have additional residences, both single family homes and multi-family properties that are located on corner lots that do not have driveways. They have garages located “around the corner” that have wide aprons in the parkway area. They, too, have been ticketed without warning and have lost needed parking spaces. Their aprons are sufficiently long and wide to allow for a car to park parallel to the street, again without blocking or encroaching upon sidewalk or street.

We have learned that it is not illegal to park on an apron according to the California Vehicle Code so long as the car does not extend on the sidewalk. Apron parking is apparently only a violation of an LAMC provision, assuming the City considers the apron to be part of the parkway. (However, this interpretation is not entirely clear from the City’s definition of “parkway” in Section 80.00(h), which refers to the portion of the “street” other than roadway or sidewalk.

We would therefore propose that the City amend the LAMC provision governing apron parking to read: Los Angeles Municipal Code - Chapter VIII Traffic Section 80.00 Division “N” Parking Prohibited or Limited

SEC. 80.53. STANDING IN PARKWAYS PROHIBITED. No person shall stop, stand or park a vehicle within any parkway, except in a permitted driveway apron whose length is such that the vehicle stopped, standing or parked does not encroach on the sidewalk or the street including the convenience strip.

(Definitions (h) “Parkway” shall mean that portion of a street other than a roadway or a sidewalk.)

If CF 10-1673 is adopted, a permit system for vehicles parked across driveways can be implemented (similar to current parking districts) and the same permit system can be adopted for those parking on the aprons. Permits would be issued only to those residents of single family or multi-family residences who could park on their aprons without encroaching upon the adjacent sidewalk or street. The cost of the permits would cover the administration fee and would be self-supporting.

We respectfully request that this issue be addressed with urgency as the recent enforcement has left residents with few options. Our City needs to protect and preserve these affordable older multi-family housing units and the stability of our community. We have seen too many affordable units lost to new projects where density bonuses are awarded for a mere one or two “affordable” units....while 4, 6, 8, 10 or 12 truly affordable units have been lost. The loss of needed parking makes each of these properties more vulnerable to development.

We trust the City Attorney will be requested to draft an amendment to the current LAMC to address apron parking while respecting the needs of the disabled.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,



Barbara Broide
President



RESIDENTS OF BEVERLY GLEN, INC.

Hon. Bill Rosendahl
Chairman, Transportation Committee
Los Angeles City Council
200 N. Spring Street, Room 415
Los Angeles, CA 90212

July 26, 2011

Dear Councilman Rosendahl:

I am writing to you on behalf of the more than 600 families who live on and off of Beverly Glen Blvd, between Sunset Blvd. and Mulholland Dr. in support of Council Motion #11-1158, which would prevent commercial vehicle parking along Beverly Glen Blvd. between Wilshire Blvd. and Comstock Avenue.

We represent the area immediately north of the community addressed in this motion. We are a heavily-trafficked, curvy canyon road with no sidewalks. Commercial vehicles are restricted from our canyon; however, Beverly Glen is frequently used, illegally, by commercial vehicles as an alternative to the 405 – in fact vehicles on the way from the Valley to serve the homes in the area affected by the current ordinance are likely to have arrived there after illegally driving through Beverly Glen canyon.

Because our community was developed in the early 1900's, many homes in our area are just feet from the street, so commercial vehicles are not only dangerous, but create significant noise that echoes through the canyon. Because we have no sidewalks, people walk with their children and pets in the parking lanes, which are often hidden from drivers' view because of the winding road. Trucks make this even more dangerous.

We write in support of this motion because it recognizes "the ongoing disruptive presence of commercial vehicles," which is true in our neighborhood as well. **We ask that you not only codify the parking restriction but ensure that the appropriate department enforces it.** Currently there is only one LAPD officer who is trained in commercial enforcement to cover the entire Westside, including all of your district and most of Councilman Koretz's district. This enforcement does not adequately allow for enforcement of the commercial vehicle restriction. Lack of current parking enforcement in our area leads us to believe that the new restriction may be placarded, but won't be adequately enforced.

We're sorry to say it, but people won't follow rules just because you make them.

Thank you for your attention to this important issue. This is a basic quality of life issue for those of us who live in the canyon. We urge passage and enforcement of CF#11-1158, as well as other existing restrictions on commercial vehicles.

Sincerely,

Evelyn Jerome Alexander
Traffic Committee Chair
Residents of Beverly Glen, Inc.

cc: Councilmember Paul Koretz
City Clerk – John White