

Off-Street Parking Update – Community Meeting #1

West Oakland Senior Center (10/22/15)

MEETING NOTES

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

- **ATTENDANCE**

- Keith Tanner + Neil Gray + Ed Manasse – Strategic Planning (PRESENTING)
- In audience, approximately 25 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*

- **Historic Use**
 - Speaker supports flexible parking for these types of structures
- **Downtown**
 - City needs to address abuse of street parking by City employees; great spaces taken by City vehicles
- **Conditional Use Permits**
 - City should not remove CUPs but keep these requirements in place as a form of leverage
- **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
- **Port Area**
 - What about maritime parking and the rules and policies in Port of Oakland property?
- **Seniors**
 - Seniors need cars to get around so their parking should not be taken away
 - Parking is important at senior housing complexes, for guests of seniors as well as residents
 - Parking at senior housing may be reduced for residents but needed for staff who work there
- **Leasing parking**
 - If someone has excess parking spaces, can they be rented out to others?
 - i. City is proposing that different land uses can share parking spaces between them*
- **AB 744**
 - What effect will this new bill have? Will state law trump some of these City requirements?
 - i. State law will override City regulations in some cases, though mostly policies are aligned.*
- **Project funding**
 - If some projects are hard to fund because they don't have enough parking, is San Francisco experiencing this too, where there are lower parking requirements and in some cases maximums?

i. SF is a very different case because developers can charge much higher rents

- **Best Practices**

- Look to European cities where there are more bikes than cars and rapid & frequent transit
- As a parallel, Seattle reduced its minimums, and studies show same parking amount still built
- City needs to do more investigation as to best practices in other cities to push farther
- Other cities around Oakland are doing much more to reduce parking; these policies don't do enough

- **Maximums**

- City must do more like other jurisdictions in the Bay; consider maximums

- **Unbundling**

- Unbundling should be everywhere in Oakland
- This seems like a logical proposal; why not do this everywhere instead of limiting it to downtown?

- **True cost of parking**

- Currently those without cars must subsidize driving and parking for those with cars—must end
- Not fair that those with no car must pay hidden costs while drivers expect to park for free on streets
- Why can we park a car on public property for free? Can't put a couch next to a curb, even if we paid
- Just because it is theoretically less expensive to build housing with less parking, how do we know those savings will be passed along to consumers and not just pocketed by developers?

- **Right-sized parking**

- Important to respect a variety of different needs, preferences, and transportation choices
- Goal should be a right-sized parking policy that creates not too much and not too little
- Element of equity—some don't own cars or drive, so they should not have to pay costs of parking
 - i. Many things that citizens pay for that benefit others and not themselves, like schools*
 - ii. In this case, parking doesn't benefit all and has negative effects too, unlike school funding*

- **Transportation Planning**

- Parking changes need to accompany an update to our transportation management
- City needs better leadership and oversight with its overall approach to transportation
 - i. Mayor appointed Transportation Policy Director and is forming a Department of Transportation*
- Matt Nichols has been reached out to many times but given no response

- **On-street Parking**

- How will on-street and off-street parking issues be coordinated?
- Some neighborhoods don't want overregulation with permit parking throughout the City
- Residential Permit Parking needs to be better managed as too many are being distributed
- Some RPP is being abused and given to commercial users or store merchants
- Because some areas of the City were built before cars, these have limited space and need street parking

- **Spillover effects**

- Many neighborhoods already experience spillover onto streets from those like CCA not providing enough parking and encouraging their drivers to park on streets
- With possibility of AirBnb coming in unregulated, must consider impacts this will have on parking
 - i. Debate about impacts of AirBnb should be tabled for a separate meeting*

- Berkeley has policy to restrict residential parking permits distributed to only to those residing in neighborhood to ensure a new development does not encourages residents to park on streets
- Double parking is already a big problem in places—what is the City doing to address this?
- **Bicycle Parking & Use**
 - There is a need for more secure bike parking, which would encourage more bicycling
 - City must address issues with bike theft and safety to encourage more bike use
 - How will these changes impact bike parking?
 - Can a bike parking space take the place of a car space? For secondary units this could save space.
 - i. *Bike parking likely can substitute for car parking in some instances but must be researched*
- **Alternative modes**
 - Shuttles and alternative means of transportation should be looked at by the City as options
 - City needs to modernize and embrace new technology like Uber, Lyft, app-based shared transit
 - Why is there not more demand response transit like Uber occurring in the City?
- **Transit coordination**
 - Policy to provide free transit passes should not just be AC Transit but Clipper Cards for BART too
 - City must improve transit and facilitate better connections between different modes like bikes
 - If City had better transit that was safer and more frequent, these changes would be more realistic
 - Policies should reflect reality: ½ mile to BART is reasonable expectation to walk, but most will only walk ¼ mile to a bus stop
 - i. *Important to consider state policy, which will allow reductions for certain housing types near “Major Transit Stops” as defined by state code, including intersections of frequent bus lines*
- **Changing City**
 - More development, more density, and more residents having to live on lots means more cars on street
 - Traffic is getting worse and parking is becoming harder to find as it is before these proposed changes
 - As City changes, must adapt to new needs—parking structures should be flexible for converted uses
- **City’s Proposal**
 - Change will not be easy but it is important to eventually transition people away from cars
 - Speed of these changes proposed is too great for City and it must transition more slowly
 - How will alleys be factored into the City’s new regulations?
 - When can citizens expect changes to be put into effect?
 - i. *Should go to City Council sometime in early to mid-2016*