



Nov. 29, 2023

Los Angeles Regional Planning Commission
320 W. Temple Street
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Dear Los Angeles County Regional Planning Commissioners,

Before you is an opportunity to support both the county's transportation system and its affordable housing goals—with an eye toward sustainability—all in one motion.

You can do all this by reducing parking requirements, via the Multifamily Residential Parking Ordinance, on the agenda for your Nov. 29 meeting. Please approve the ordinance, which is an important starting place on the need to reduce parking minimums in multifamily developments.

Needlessly rigid parking requirements are the norm for many new housing developments. They increase our carbon emissions and worsen traffic on LA County's already congested streets by incentivizing driving. They forbid many of the charming and iconic small-scale apartment buildings that local developers constructed during the heyday of noteworthy southern California architecture.

Of particular concern is their impact on the cost of housing. Not only do high parking minimums raise the cost of construction, which then gets passed down to tenants in new multifamily buildings; these overly prescriptive rules also limit the amount of housing getting built at all. In a housing shortage, driven by the scarcity of available homes, that makes housing more expensive for everyone.

This matters, especially because the County of Los Angeles is under an imperative to dramatically increase its housing production in order to meet its Regional Housing Needs Assessment targets. To do so it must build new housing at all income levels. Parking reform is a key tool to help local governments do just that. Research into the City of San Diego found that, when parking minimums were abolished locally, what followed was a significant boost in the production of market-rate housing, units in 100% affordable housing projects, and affordable units in mixed-income housing projects. The increase in deed-restricted affordable units was particularly dramatic.

Reducing parking minimums also facilitates the construction of small multifamily complexes, often called "missing middle" housing. These are the small apartment buildings that may fit within the fabric of a neighborhood but for which a large parking garage would never be financially or architecturally feasible. It's important to note that empirical research has shown repeatedly that eliminating parking minimums does not eliminate the construction of off-street parking by developers. Rather, parking reform allows builders to right-size parking for their particular projects. In some cases, that means building less parking, and in some cases, none.

The reduction in parking spots reduces the cost of construction, and as a consequence can dramatically decrease rents.

Parking even reform aligns with LA County's climate goals. Oversupply of parking incentivizes driving and increases carbon emissions. With transportation constituting the greatest source of emissions in California, parking reform holds the promise of addressing both housing affordability and climate change.

Lastly, we would be remiss if we didn't share a place where this ordinance has room for improvement. Even though the item represents an important step forward, you, as a commission, have the opportunity to go even further. A previous version of the ordinance would have placed no parking minimum on housing developments 10 units or smaller. This was the kind of change that would have allowed for the construction of bungalow courts and many of the smaller apartments Angelenos love because of their ability to help facilitate walkable, architecturally interesting neighborhoods. Local buildings like these were built predominantly in the pre-war era, before the advent of such strict parking regulations, and they help make Los Angeles County the beautiful place it is today.

Despite overwhelming support for parking reform from both the public and from the commission in a July 26 hearing, planning staff introduced a new parking requirement for complexes of this size. This change was without merit, and we encourage the commission to reintroduce the removal of parking requirements for developments 10 units or smaller. Again, this would not mean the end of parking, but rather just an opportunity for developers to build the right-sized project to meet their needs.

We are thrilled about this exciting opportunity to help us build a more affordable, sustainable and livable region and hope that you will join us in supporting parking reform for LA County.

Sincerely,

Scott Epstein

Scott Epstein
Director of Policy and Research
Abundant Housing LA

Jacob Pierce

Jacob Pierce
Policy Associate
Abundant Housing LA

Alyson Stewart

From: The Malkin Family <dtmalkin@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, October 27, 2023 8:09 AM
To: Drp Parking Study
Cc: Teri Malkin
Subject: Multifamily Residential Parking Ordinance

CAUTION: External Email. Proceed Responsibly.

From:
Teri Malkin
18021 Galatina St.
Rowland Hts., CA 91748
626-833-7862

1. I am 100% against this proposed ordinance. It ignores the fact that the infrastructure does not yet exist to get residents from point A to point B in the County easily without a car. This includes medical appointments, college and work.
2. By creating more compact parking spaces (including tandem ones) without having any idea how many compact and sub-compact cars are needed by residents vis-a-vis regular-sized cars, this will create more street parking and more damage to regularly sized cars parked next to each other.
3. Total disregard for existing multi-family dwelling residents who already have parking problems (heard at the meeting).
4. Tandem parking will not work if residents are from different households and one needs to "get out".
5. With street parking full, what happens on street cleaning day?

6. What about multi-family residents who are also multi-generational and need more vehicles when the County does not yet have the infra-structure to get them there? refer to #1 also, but with multi-generational families needing more than one vehicle.

7. There is no mention of hills and other obstacles that prevent people from getting to and from public transportation.

Alyson Stewart

From: Christina Fernandez <cxfpetunia@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, October 29, 2023 3:21 AM
To: Drp Parking Study
Subject: Project #2022-003630 (1-5)

CAUTION: External Email. Proceed Responsibly.

Reduced parking guideline and increase in multi family units.

As residents of Rowland Heights since 1965, we are against the proposed density in our neighborhoods. People were already making illegal makeshift rooms in single family homes and filling streets with more cars before the ADU/JADU changes. The unincorporated areas are being taken advantage of.

Maria Fernandez
Christina Fernandez
19367 Baelen St
Rowland Heights Ca 91748

Sent from my iPhone

Alyson Stewart

From: Susan Kearns <sstkearns@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, October 30, 2023 11:38 AM
To: Drp Parking Study
Subject: Project #2022-003630 (1-5) / Opposing C

CAUTION: External Email. Proceed Responsibly.

Dear Sir or Madame,

I am against project #2022-003630 (1-5). I do not like or want the parking reduction and elimination for multi family residenceals.

Susan Kearns
18337 Kara Pl, Rowland Heights, CA 91748