

Off-Street Parking Update – Community Meeting #2
Fruitvale – San Antonio Senior Center (10/29/15)

MEETING NOTES

The meeting generally followed the compiled PowerPoint, and these notes focus on the areas of feedback

- **ATTENDANCE**

- Keith Tanner + Neil Gray – Strategic Planning (PRESENTING)
- In audience, approximately 10 people
- [See separate sign in sheet for individual names, upon request]

Key Discussion Points *(City responses in italics)*

**Note – because responses have been grouped by topic, differing opinions by separate speakers are sometimes grouped*

- **Right-sized parking**

- City should just let developers build the number they prefer, instead of requiring a minimum
- People can complain about lack of parking to City, but no mechanism to complain about excess parking
- City is trying to pick the right ratios, but this is very difficult and will last years, though parking needs and transportation patterns are shifting so rapidly with new technology and demographic shifts
- Let developers do the work of estimating appropriate parking for each project; they have a greater incentive to get it right and the tools to do so, and if they continue to get it wrong, they're out of business; if the City gets the ratios wrong, they are implemented in the City for decades

- **Spillover effects & On-Street parking**

- Spillover parking issues can be managed through better handling of residential parking permits
- Existing residents should get R.P.P. that tenants of new buildings cannot, and developer can create the amount of parking they decide makes the most sense as long as there are no parking requirements – addresses potential of spillover from new development because existing residents get permits
- We need more R.P.P. created through nexus studies – permits should cost only enough to administer and enforce the program

- i. *Residential Parking Permits are hard to formulate and typically require 100% neighbor approval*
- ii. Change the policy then so that these can be approved by a majority, not 100% consensus

- **Best Practices**

- Why can't Oakland be more like Berkeley or SF in having progressive parking policies?
- Shoup recommends removing minimums entirely and having on-street management, not picking certain percentage reductions while still requiring a baseline of mandatory parking

- **Project funding**

- Developer in audience created a rental housing complex in Berkeley with no parking and got financing
- Eliminating parking creation reduces costs for developer by 10-20%
 - i. City should consider incentives for developers making rental units that reduce parking
 - ii. *City's proposal would allow developers including affordable housing to reduce parking amounts*

- **Secondary Units**

- To relieve housing crisis, Oaklanders should be able to create in-law units more easily
 - i. *City is considering a proposal right now to make secondary units more feasible*

- **Housing & Affordability**

- Gentrification is leading to higher housing costs and displacing current residents; City needs to remove obstacles to creating more housing and affordable options, such as requiring more excess parking
- There need to be more places for sleeping, not more spaces for parking cars
- Parking is expensive and drives up housing costs, and parking requirements lead to overbuilt structures where half the spaces are unused

- **Downtown**

- City must consider equity issues for lower income populations and minorities coming to downtown and needing to park, if it will make parking harder to find or more expensive than it currently is
 - i. Transit use for those coming downtown should be encouraged as alternative to driving
 - ii. But transit use is less feasible for those with kids and larger families
- Will Parking Study extend citywide?
 - i. *Only covers downtown; contact Michael Ford for more information on results*

- **Front yard parking**

- In many neighborhoods, cars are being parked on front yards on lawns right up to sidewalk, making it difficult to walk as pedestrians and also unpleasant visibly; narrow lots should not get to pave yards

i. There is existing policy in code that requires half of front yard to remain unpaved

- **Driveway widths**
 - Proposal for 19' seems too wide an amount
 - Cars plus motorcycles can fit within 19' – consider a lower width
- **Elected officials**
 - Who should public reach out to if they want to advocate for more progressive policies?
 - i. Reach out to Mayor's office, Councilmembers, and CED Committee members*
- **Narrow Lots**
 - Permitting some lots to have lower parking requirements because of narrow widths seems arbitrary; many corridors and buildings on old lots developed at a time when no cars existed—reduce for all
- **Mandatory**
 - All new developments should be required to unbundle and provide free transit passes
 - i. Developer willing to unbundle and provide carshare, but feels transit passes should be partially subsidized (tenant pays small percentage of cost and must buy in)*
- **Reductions**
 - Include more areas around transit that can qualify for reductions
 - Reductions should not be capped at 50% but should be allowed to go further if all are implemented
- **Impact fee**
 - Maximum may not be appropriate, but what about a transit impact fee instead? There could be a loose “cap” that if a developer went beyond, a fee would have to be paid
 - i. One planner is working on a development impact fee right now*
 - ii. Any transportation fee would have to calculate the impacts of excess parking on City*
 - iii. Impact fee could vary for developments with parking and without, since different impacts*
- **Transportation Planning**
 - Does the City coordinate at all with AC Transit, because this seems to be very relevant?
 - i. Not enough.*
 - The effort in Oakland should be to shift more people to transit use as downtown gets more dense
- **Use changes**
 - Why have any requirements for any kind of use change, regardless of type or history? An old warehouse converted into housing will be difficult to create parking for, but should be allowed without cars

- The City's definition of historic, tied to 1965, is arbitrary and will be outdated; why not follow Alameda and proclaim any structure at least 10 years old as requiring no parking additions between use change?
- **Unbundling**
 - Unbundling should be everywhere in Oakland, not just in downtown
- **Shared Parking**
 - Sharing parking among uses and properties is a great idea—do it!
- **Changing City**
 - Fewer youth in California are getting licenses, driving, and buying cars, reflecting a shift to less driving and less of a need for parking in the future
- **City's Proposal**
 - These changes don't go far enough; are there progressive planners in the City interested in pushing for more forward-thinking reforms, but conservative neighborhoods are pushing back and refusing?
 - i. *There is concern that building more housing with no parking, that will stand for many years to come, will spillover parking needs into neighborhoods already crowded with cars*
 - ii. What about equal concern of building structures with excessive parking that will last years?