

**SUMMARY OF PUBLIC HEARING PROCEEDINGS  
REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION  
PROJECT NO. R2022-003630-(1-5)  
ADVANCE PLANNING CASE NO. RPPL2023004576  
ENVIRONMENTAL PLAN CASE NO. RPPL2023005132  
MULTIFAMILY RESIDENTIAL PARKING ORDINANCE**

**March 1, 2023**

On March 1, 2023, the Regional Planning Commission (Commission) conducted a duly-noticed public hearing to consider the Multifamily Residential Parking Ordinance (Ordinance), Advance Planning Case No. RPPL2022009338. Regional Planning staff (staff) and the project consultant provided an overview of the Ordinance.

The Commission asked how the Ordinance will help or deter multifamily housing in very dense urban communities where the Housing Element will rezone to meet the County's regional housing needs. Staff noted that most of these communities would qualify under AB 2097. Staff also noted that many other jurisdictions have eliminated parking standards, and that the Ordinance takes a measured approach by eliminating just 25 percent of required parking.

The Commission pointed out that the utilization of small or odd-shaped lots makes sense, but in dense areas, there are buildable lots that can accommodate current parking requirements. Staff noted that the parking elimination will encourage building more middle housing.

The Commission raised concerns that in certain communities, a developer may choose to forgo parking, which could have a large impact on the community.

The Commission received testimony from seven speakers. One speaker spoke in favor of the Ordinance as the current parking requirements are too restrictive from allowing small lots from being built with housing, and pointed out that lower parking minimums, rather than parking eliminations, will provide flexibility to build small housing projects and still attract tenants who need parking. Six speakers spoke against the Ordinance due to potential impacts on street parking in their neighborhoods, potential pollution of adding more housing, the lack of effective parking enforcement, and the reality that many households own up to five cars, and that the Ordinance may exacerbate traffic around schools, hinder evacuations in neighborhoods that are within Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones (VHFHSZ), and impact quality of life.

On a motion by Vice Chair O'Connor and seconded by Commissioner Moon, the Commission moved to close the public hearing and adopt the resolution to recommend that the Board of Supervisors consider and certify the Negative Declaration and adopt the proposed Ordinance, but the motion failed with a vote of 1-4.

Chair Hastings, in his no vote, stated that very few private lenders will approve housing projects that offer no parking, and that shrinking the lengths and widths of parking spaces and drive aisles is problematic as it does not accommodate current vehicle sizes. He also

stated that the County is not well served by safe, reliable mass transit. He also expressed concerns about shared parking agreements and parking enforcement. He stated that it is land cost that drives the affordability issues, and people in general will not stop driving, and do not want to park far from their homes. He also expressed concerns over AB 2097 usurping local land use authority. Vice Chair O'Connor pointed out that our current parking requirements were made over 40 years ago, in 1983, when the County was mostly auto-centric with no mass transit, and this change is long overdue. Our mass transit came only through Measures M and R passed by voters. Vice Chair O'Connor applauded the passage of AB 2097, and pointed out that the bill does not prohibit parking, just that it is no longer required. Developers may still build parking, and the Ordinance will allow greater flexibility and addresses the fiscal burdens of current parking requirements, and encourages gentle density rather than lot consolidation to build large-scale luxury development.

**VOTE:**

Concurring: O'Connor

Dissenting: Duarte-White, Moon, Louie, and Hastings

Abstaining: None

Absent: None

Action Date: March 1, 2023

**November 29, 2023**

On November 29, 2023, the Commission conducted a duly-noticed public hearing to consider Advance Planning Case No. RPPL2023004576, the Multifamily Residential Parking Ordinance, which included several revisions made to address concerns expressed at the March 1 public hearing, and received testimony from nine members of the public who were present in person.

Eight speakers spoke in general support of the Ordinance as an important step in getting more housing built, and all requested the Commission to consider amending the Ordinance to remove parking minimums for small housing developments of 10 or fewer dwelling units.

One speaker expressed concerns, asking that individual studies be conducted to assess the impact of eliminating parking in areas targeted for affordable housing, and address the parking needs of residents.

Due to a loss of quorum, the Commission did not receive testimony from four members of the public who joined virtually, and the Commission moved to continue the hearing to December 13, 2023.

## **December 13, 2023**

Staff and the consultant provided an overview of the Ordinance to the Commission. Staff noted that the Ordinance addresses the concerns over parking policies that have been raised by the Commission and testifiers since the public hearing on March 1, 2023.

The Commission expressed concerns over the impact of state mandates on local projects. The consultant responded that the parking study was completed before AB 2097 and was conducted independently of the state's directives, focusing solely on areas outside of transit zones. The consultant also noted that the Ordinance includes parking reductions with Transportation Demand Management measures, as opposed to eliminating parking requirements entirely.

The Commission asked if the parking study considered the spillover of multifamily parking issues into single-family areas. The consultant acknowledged the community's concerns about on-street parking and mentioned the County's initiative to enhance enforcement and regulation of on-street parking. They also noted the role of the lack of housing affordability in exacerbating these problems.

The Commission questioned how the Ordinance, which recommends one parking space per dwelling unit for projects with 10 or fewer units, could incentivize the development of such housing. The Commission also asked if a building could be constructed on a 50-foot-wide lot, under the proposed requirement of one parking space per dwelling unit. The consultant affirmed that it is possible and that reducing parking requirements would increase the likelihood of such developments.

The Commission asked if the utilization of TDM strategies would lower the need for parking below what the market might demand. The consultant confirmed that it is possible, especially in buildings with nearby amenities like grocery stores, where not everyone feels the need for two cars. Staff also noted the County's intent for developing more TDM measures for Title 16, which would offer more comprehensive options for managing parking in the public right-of-way.

The Commission received testimony from five speakers. One speaker, who came in person, spoke in favor of the Ordinance generally and requested the Commission consider amending the Ordinance to remove parking minimums for small housing developments. Four speakers, who joined virtually, also spoke in favor and asked to remove parking requirements for small housing developments.

The Commission asked about the difference in rental rates for developments with limited parking. The consultant responded that reduced parking requirements lower construction costs for developers, which would result in more affordable housing, although this is not always the case. Furthermore, developers must consider whether they can find tenants for buildings with reduced parking.

On a motion by Commissioner Moon and seconded by Commissioner Louie, the Commission moved to close the public hearing and adopted the resolution to recommend

that the Board of Supervisors consider and certify the Negative Declaration and adopt the Ordinance in its entirety, with a vote of 3-2. Vice Chair O'Connor voted no and expressed a desire to eliminate parking minimums for smaller developments. Chair Hastings voted no and voiced reservations about modifying parking spaces and driveways that will not accommodate larger vehicle sizes.

**VOTE:**

Concurring: Duarte-White, Moon, and Louie

Dissenting: Hastings and O'Connor

Abstaining: None

Absent: None

Action Date: December 13, 2023