



## DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING SUPPLEMENTAL RECOMMENDATION REPORT



### CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

**DATE:** July 14, 2011  
**TIME:** after 8:30 a.m.\*  
**PLACE:** Los Angeles City Hall  
200 North Spring Street  
Room 350  
Los Angeles, CA 90012

**CASE NO:** CPC-2007-2216-CA  
**COUNCIL FILES:** 07-2991; 09-0206  
**CEQA:** ENV-2011-308-ND  
**LOCATION:** Citywide  
**COUNCIL DISTRICT:** All  
**PLAN AREAS:** All

### PUBLIC HEARING REQUIRED

### MATTER CONTINUED FROM MEETING OF APRIL 28, 2011

**SUMMARY:** A proposed ordinance (Appendix C) amending Sections 12.04, 12.24, 12.32, 13.00, and adding Section 13.16 of the Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC) to create a Modified Parking Requirement (MPR) District offering seven optional parking requirement modification tools including (1) change of use parking standards, (2) use of a new Parking Reduction Permit, (3) off-site parking within 1500 feet, (4) decreased parking requirements, (5) increased parking requirements, (6) commercial parking credits, and (7) maximum parking limits.

### RECOMMENDED ACTIONS:

1. **Adopt** the initial and supplemental staff reports (dated April 28, 2011 and July 14, 2011) as its reports on the subject.
2. **Adopt** the findings in Attachment 1.
3. **Adopt** the Negative Declaration as the CEQA clearance on the subject.
4. **Disapprove** the previously approved ordinance and not recommend its adoption by City Council.
5. **Approve** the proposed ordinance (Appendix C) and recommend its adoption by City Council.

MICHAEL LOGRANDE  
Director of Planning

ALAN BELL, AICP  
Deputy Director

CHARLIE J. RAUSCH, JR.  
Senior City Planner, Office of Zoning Administration

LINN K. WYATT  
Chief Zoning Administrator

THOMAS ROTHMANN  
City Planner, Code Studies  
Telephone: (213) 978-1891

**ADVICE TO PUBLIC:** \*The exact time this report will be considered during the meeting is uncertain since there may be several other items on the agenda. Written communication may be mailed to the Commission Secretariat, 200 North Main Street, Room 272, Los Angeles, CA 90012 (Phone No. 213/978-1300). While all written communications are given to the Commission for consideration, the initial packets are sent a week prior to the Commission's meeting date. If you challenge these agenda items in court, you may be limited to raising only those issues you or someone else raised at the public hearing agendaized herein, or in written correspondence on these matters delivered to this agency at or prior to the public hearing. As a covered entity under Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act, the City of Los Angeles does not discriminate on the basis of disability, and upon request, will provide reasonable accommodation to ensure equal access to these programs, services, and activities. Sign language interpreters, assistive listening devices, or other auxiliary aids and/or other services may be provided upon request. To ensure availability of services, please make your request no later than three working days (72 hours) prior to the meeting by calling the Commission Secretariat at 213/978-1300.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>SUMMARY</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>STAFF REPORT</b>	<b>4</b>
Hearings	4
Parking Summit	4
Overview of MPR District	6
Modifications to Ordinance	8
<b>CONCLUSION</b>	<b>9</b>

### ATTACHMENTS:

**ATTACHMENT 1 – FINDINGS**

**APPENDIX C – PROPOSED ORDINANCE**

## SUMMARY

The intersection of required automobile parking and land use is a topic that affects every resident of Los Angeles. As such, the City must balance parking convenience with traffic congestion when estimating the number of parking spaces needed by different land uses. Generally, these numbers are derived by measuring such variables as: the number of apartments in a building, beds in a hospital, or square footage in a restaurant. Yet, regardless of what neighborhood the project is in these standards remain constant.

The Department of City Planning is proposing a new multi-faceted Modified Parking Requirement (MPR) District that will enhance the City's ability to develop parking strategies that are tailored to the unique circumstances of individual communities. The MPR District will offer seven parking strategies and tools to be included, individually or in combination, for each district: 1) change of use parking standards; 2) use of a Parking Reduction Permit; 3) off-site parking for all uses within 1500 feet; 4) decreased parking standards; 5) increased parking standards; 6) commercial parking credits; and 7) maximum parking requirements.

The parking tools in the revised ordinance (Appendix C) allow carefully selected areas to benefit from modified parking requirements while also protecting neighborhoods from spillover parking impacts. These benefits may include encouraging transit use and pedestrian activity in areas well served by transit, reducing housing costs and enhancing housing options by not requiring unneeded parking, increased open space and other amenities provided on land or floor area not dedicated for parking, improved urban design, and environmental and public health benefits from reducing reliance on the single-occupancy automobile.

On March 30, 2011, the Planning Department staff held a hearing on the proposed ordinance and on April 28, 2011, the CPC held a public hearing on it. Many questions and concerns were raised at both hearings that warranted a more in depth analysis of parking as it relates to land use in the City. On May 12, 2011, the CPC held a half-day parking summit to increase public awareness on the complexities and issues surrounding required parking. The CPC invited 14 parking professionals to speak on a variety of parking related issues as they pertain to Los Angeles.

The revised proposed ordinance (Appendix C) is substantially the same as the previously proposed ordinance however several changes have been made. Additional findings were added for MPR Districts that include increased and decreased parking standards. The minimum size for an MPR District has been increased from three acres to five acres, an entire block, or two block faces. MPR Districts cannot be established in specific plans. Lastly, exceptions for rent stabilized units and projects that utilize parking reductions for providing affordable housing have been incorporated into the ordinance.

## STAFF REPORT

### HEARINGS

On March 30, 2011, the Planning Department staff held a hearing on this ordinance. There were 23 speakers, 17 in opposition and six in support. On April 28, 2011, the City Planning Commission held its first public hearing on this matter. There were 27 speakers, 13 in opposition and 14 in favor of the proposed ordinance. Opposition to the ordinance focused primarily on parking spillover effects on neighborhoods when parking is reduced in nearby commercial areas. Support for the ordinance focused on the need for the City to revise its parking requirements to better support pedestrian-oriented neighborhoods.

### PARKING SUMMIT

On May 12, 2011, the City Planning Commission hosted a three-part parking discussion during its regularly scheduled public meeting. There were 14 invited speakers who spoke on a variety of parking issues.

**Part One** of the summit "Setting the Stage: Parking Policy as Los Angeles Matures and the Regional Transit System is Built," focused primarily on the City's parking policies and its connection to the City's expanding transit system. The invited speakers on this topic were Robin Blair, a Planning Director at LA Metro; Jay Kim, Acting Assistant General Manager for the Office of Parking Management, Planning and Regulations with LADOT; Hasan Ikhata, Executive Director of SCAG; Stefanos Polyzoides, principal at Moule & Polyzoides Architects; and Gwynne Pugh, Santa Monica City Planning Commissioner.

The discussion in Part One focused primarily on the importance of sound parking policies around existing and planned transit stations. Parking policies must support and complement the increase in rail and must meet Federal guidelines for transit funding. These Federal guidelines mandate relatively low parking requirements near transit to support the vision of changing land uses around transit and less reliance on single occupancy vehicles.

The discussion in Part One also addressed the costs and practicality of incorporating parking into development projects. Essentially, parking drives what developers can actually build on lots and invariably ends up dominating the architectural layout. Flexibility in the number and location of parking will assist in lessening the dominance of parking within newer buildings and provide opportunities for shared parking. Incorporating parking into all development projects is expensive. Each parking stall is about 350 square feet (including the driveway, circulation and particularly the ramps). A two-bedroom unit demands 850 square feet of parking. Above grade parking can cost between \$12,000- 15,000 per parking stall and below grade parking starts off around \$35,000 per parking stall.

**Part Two** of the summit "Academic Perspectives on Minimum Parking Requirements: Congestion and the Cost of Housing, Goods, and Services" focused primarily on the economic factors of municipal parking policies. The invited speakers on this topic were Mike Manville, a postdoctoral scholar at the Lewis Center for Regional Policy Studies and the Institute of Transportation Studies at UCLA; and Donald Shoup, PhD., Director of the Institute of Transportation Studies and Chair of the Department of Urban Planning at UCLA.

The discussion in Part Two focused primarily on the economic and traffic impacts created by minimum parking requirements. For example, minimum parking requirements mandate that housing has to be accompanied by a certain amount of parking, which increased the cost of housing and decreases the cost of driving which results in less housing and more driving and congestion. For people who do drive this minimum parking requirement functions as a subsidy. For people who do not drive, this minimum parking requirement is a penalty.

One of the most important aspects of parking regulations is that the zoning code just says you have to provide X amount of parking, and it doesn't matter how much it costs. But in reality parking can be extraordinarily pricey. More importantly, the marginal cost of a parking space can be two or three times the original price. The cost of housing rises and cumulatively, the city loses a lot of housing units and the composition of the housing supply changes. Developers would tend to build bigger units with two parking spaces for each unit, which is not aiming at lower income people. The parking requirement does not only change the amount of housing you get, but also changes who the housing is marketed towards.

Parking requirements can also prevent the reuse of old buildings. Tangible results from the Adaptive Reuse Ordinance (ARO) proves that removing minimum parking requirements results in more housing production and it created 14,000 units. The ARO allowed developers to build housing without parking, allowed people to use old buildings, and allowed investment in neighborhoods that had largely been empty for decades. All of that was the result of removing minimum parking requirements. Another observation from the success of the ARO is that the removal of parking requirements incentivized the demand for privately-operated centralized parking.

Los Angeles has more parking spaces per square mile than any other city on Earth. And Downtown Los Angeles has more parking spaces per square mile than any other downtown on Earth. It never seems to be enough, partly because it is free to most users. For most land uses you have to provide more parking area than building area. Los Angeles has expensive housing and free parking. Minimum parking requirements make affordable housing difficult to build. The minimum parking requirements are the real barrier to building allowed density in this city; not floor area limits. It is not the dwelling units allowed per acre, it is the minimum parking requirements.

**Part Three** of the summit "Local Examples & Expertise: Critical Analysis," focused primarily

on parking as it relates to affordable housing and the effect of current parking policies as it relates to small business and property owners. The invited speakers on this topic were Bruce Silberman, President and CEO of Allied Parking; Helmi Hisserich, Assistant General Manager at the Los Angeles Housing Department; Lisa Payne, Policy Director for the Southern California Association of Nonprofit Housing (SCANPH); Shashi Hanuman, Directing Attorney of Public Counsel's Community Development Group; Mott Smith, Principal for Civic Enterprises; and Michael Tharp, land use planner and consultant.

The discussion in Part Three focused on parking-related affordable housing incentives. Concern was expressed that lowering parking requirements could create pressure to convert rent stabilized units into condominiums. A current barrier to condo conversions is that many older apartments in the City are rent stabilized and have grandfathered less-than code required parking. Should the parking requirements be lowered, many older units could meet the new lower standards and be easily converted. Another issue focused on impacts that the proposed ordinance might have on an existing Zoning Code provision that allows reductions in parking when residential affordable units are included in residential projects. There is a concern that by-right reduced parking would eliminate the incentive to provide affordable housing.

The discussion in Part Three addressed how parking requirements are the single greatest barrier to the production of unsubsidized workforce housing and to the revitalization of our older commercial corridors. The City's inflexible parking standards have made parking variances the norm to allow changes of use. Several places are trying to solve this problem with shared parking programs, including Pasadena, Eagle Rock, Atwater Village, ect. The commercial parking credit program is a success in Eagle Rock. Previously, parking requirements threatened the area's historic buildings in order to build parking lots for commercial uses, thereby discouraging small businesses. The program ensures adequate parking for new businesses and increases pedestrian activity.

## **Overview of MPR District**

The proposed ordinance (Appendix C) provides a new planning tool, the Modified Parking Requirement (MPR) District, for managing parking-specific concerns in designated areas. The MPR District ordinance authorizes the establishment of a MPR District with defined boundaries, and provides a menu of seven parking-related tools that can be individually selected based upon the parking needs of the district. Given the increasing complexity of the City's parking issues, a one-size-fits-all approach to parking requirements cannot meet the needs of each neighborhood. This ordinance provides a menu of strategies for the City to adjust parking requirements in discrete areas as reliance on the automobile changes. The proposed ordinance provides the flexibility necessary to tailor parking requirements to unique circumstances by utilizing the following menu items.

- 1. Change of Use Parking Standards** - This tool would allow changes to more parking-intensive uses, such as converting a retail use to a restaurant, without

requiring additional off-street parking. New businesses could open by right where previously they would have been precluded due to insufficient parking without obtaining a Zone Variance. It is anticipated that this tool would be utilized primarily in dense areas with ample transit opportunities or other transportation options, and/or areas with large supplies of publicly-available parking.

2. **Off-Site Parking for all uses within 1,500 feet** - This tool will expand the 750 foot off-site parking radius for commercial and industrial uses, extending the off-site distance to 1500 feet for any land use. This tool will most likely be utilized in denser areas where real estate is at premium and where it is often logistically and financially difficult to provide required on-site parking. Increasing the off-site parking radius can provide an important economic development benefit. This “park once” behavior enhances overall economic activity without increasing car trips. It encourages the development of complementary businesses, such as an art gallery near a restaurant with long waits for tables.
3. **Parking Reduction Permit** - This tool would allow a new discretionary permit to reduce parking only within an MPR District. Applicants for Parking Reduction Permits could request any amount of reduced parking, provided they demonstrate that the parking reduction is warranted due to an alternative transportation strategy incorporated into the proposed project. In most areas of the City, a parking reduction requires a Zone Variance, which requires hardship findings be made. This has resulted in challenges and appeals that increase both cost and uncertainty to the City, the applicant and nearby residents. In areas where it has been determined that less restrictive parking requirements are appropriate provided that transportation alternatives exist, a more appropriate process than the Zone Variance is warranted.
4. **Decreased Parking Standards** - In areas where less parking is needed or public transit is being encouraged, decreases to standard parking requirements may be warranted. A reduction in the number of required residential, commercial or manufacturing parking spaces will provide flexibility in building design, maintain or enhance pedestrian-oriented urban design, and allow more efficient use of buildable land, which in turn reduces rents, including housing costs.. All modifications to LAMC parking requirements will be stated directly in the ordinance creating the Modified Parking Requirement District.
5. **Increased Parking Standards** - In areas where parking is insufficient to meet demand and/or public transit access is limited, increases to standard parking requirements may be warranted. An increase in the number of required residential, commercial or industrial parking spaces will provide additional off-street parking to mitigate any shortage of on-street parking and address spillover impacts from new projects. All modifications to LAMC parking requirements will be stated directly in the ordinance creating the Modified Parking Requirement District.



6. **Commercial Parking Credits** - This is a tool to assist businesses in meeting code-required parking requirements through underutilized publicly-owned or publicly-available on-street or off-street parking spaces. The number of credits and the time period(s) of their availability shall be based on a survey, which shall be approved by the Department of Transportation. Credits may be established separately for varying times of day. This tool enhances economic development by allowing changes of use by right, rather than through the Zone Variance process, in areas where it is demonstrated that adequate off-street parking exists.
7. **Maximum Parking Requirements** - Many cities in the United States have begun to supplement minimum parking requirements with maximum parking requirements in an attempt to achieve balanced land use management. Maximum parking requirements limit the number of parking spaces a developer can provide. Instead of asking developers to provide *at least* a certain number of parking spaces, developers are now asked to provide *no more* than a certain number of parking spaces. It is anticipated that this strategy would be used in a TOD where transit is being encouraged, similar to the existing parking maximums required in the Vermont Western Station Neighborhood Area Plan (SNAP).

## CHANGES TO THE PREVIOUSLY PROPOSED ORDINANCE

Based upon public testimony, expert opinions, and further research, the proposed ordinance (Appendix C) has been modified since the April 28, 2011 version. The changes are as follows:

1. An MPR cannot be established in an adopted specific plan. Since the parking tools available in an MPR could be implemented in a specific plan, this exemption would eliminate the possibility for redundancy.
2. The minimum size of an MPR has been increased from three acres to two entire block faces, one full city block, or five acres.
3. A limitation has been added that required parking for projects benefitting from reduced parking in exchange for affordable housing must be lower than the new MPR District decreased parking requirements.
4. A limitation has been added to prohibit rent stabilized units from having decreased parking in an MPR District. This provision will reduce the possibility of converting currently rent stabilized housing into condominiums.
5. Additional findings were added to address spillover parking impacts and transit availability when an MPR would include the decreased parking option.
6. Additional findings were added to address an area's lack of transit and on-street



parking when an MPR would include the increased parking option.

## **CONCLUSION**

Continuing to uniformly mandate suburban parking standards in a densifying city increases congestion and the cost of housing. Los Angeles is at a crossroads between requiring an inexpensive parking supply and supporting a burgeoning transit system. The City cannot continue to do both. Two of the biggest problems in the City are the cost of housing and traffic congestion; minimum parking requirements perpetuate both conditions. The proposed ordinance (Appendix C) is a step to move the urban landscape of Los Angeles into one that is focused on good urban form rather than the automobile.

## ATTACHMENT 1

### LAND USE FINDINGS

The City Planning Department recommends that the City Planning Commission, in accordance with Charter Section 558, find:

1. In accordance with Charter Section 556, the proposed ordinance (Appendix C) is in substantial conformance with the purposes, intent and provisions of the General Plan in that it is in substantial conformance with the purposes, intent, and provisions of the Transportation Element of the City's General Plan. Appendix C implements Policy 2.24 of the Transportation Element by implementing shared-parking, peripheral parking, and parking-pricing strategies in high-employment areas; Policy 3.10 of the Transportation Element by developing new and refined parking policy procedures for designated centers and districts; Policy 3.11 of the Transportation Element by implementing transportation improvements and demand reduction programs to mitigate the circulation impacts attributable to new development in accordance with State nexus legislation and judicial findings; Policy 3.12 of the Transportation Element to promote transit access in neighborhood districts, community and regional centers, and along mixed-use boulevards; Policy 3.14 to promote shared-parking in appropriate centers and districts; and Policy 4.1 to minimize the intrusion of traffic generated by new regional or local development into residential neighborhoods while preserving an adequate collector street system; and

The proposed ordinance (Appendix C) will encourage the development of multiple-family housing at all income levels, a goal of the General Plan. Furthermore, this ordinance implements Framework Element Objective 3.4.3, which states that the City must "[e]stablish incentives for the attraction of growth and development in the districts, centers, and mixed-use boulevards targeted for growth that may include ... [m]odified parking requirements in areas in proximity to transit or other standards that reduce the cost of development ..." Objective 4.4.1 states that the City must "[t]ake the following actions in order to increase housing production and capacity ... [s]treamline procedures for securing building permits, inspections, and other clearances needed to construct housing."; and

the proposed ordinance (Appendix C) will have no adverse effect upon the General Plan, specific plans, or any other plans being created by the Department of City Planning because the proposed ordinance is consistent with the General Plan and carries out the General Plan goals, policies and objectives discussed above. There will be no substantive changes made to the existing parking requirements established in the enabling legislation for the MPR District, therefore there will be no effects on any above-referenced plan; and

2. in accordance with Charter Section 558 (b)(2), the proposed ordinance (Appendix C) will be in conformity with public necessity, convenience, general welfare and good zoning practice in that it will allow the development of more housing by easing the process by which required parking spaces for residential uses can be reduced. Objective 4.1.8 of the General Plan Framework states that the City must “[c]reate incentives and reduce regulatory barriers in appropriate locations in order to promote the adaptive re-use of structures for housing and rehabilitation of existing units”; and in accordance with the City Planning Commission policy, “Do Real Planning”, the proposed ordinance (Appendix C) is in substantial conformance with the intent and purpose of item 12 to revisit our “one size fits all” suburban parking standards, and replace them with project and location-specific tools such as parking maximums, pooled parking, automated stacked parking, and other emerging techniques.

## **ENVIRONMENTAL FINDING**

In accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), a Negative Declaration (Attachment 2) was published on February 10, 2011. On all measures the proposed ordinance (Appendix C) will have either no or a less than significant effect on the environment. The proposed ordinance makes no changes to existing zoning, any specific plans or other land use regulations that affect the physical environment.

## APPENDIX C

### PROPOSED ORDINANCE FOR DISCUSSION

A proposed ordinance amending Sections 12.04, 12.24, 12.32, 13.00 and adding Section 13.15 of the Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC) to create a Modified Parking Requirement (MPR) District offering seven optional parking requirement modification tools including (1) change of use parking standards, (2) use of a new Parking Reduction Permit, (3) off-site parking within 1500 feet, (4) decreased parking requirements, (5) increased parking requirements, (6) commercial parking credits, and (7) maximum parking requirements.

### THE PEOPLE OF THE CITY OF LOS ANGELES DO HEREBY ORDAIN AS FOLLOWS:

**Section 1.** Subsection D of Section 12.04 of the Los Angeles Municipal Code is amended to read:

**D.** Certain portions of the City are also designated as being in one or more of the following districts, by the provisions of Article 3 of this chapter.

"O"	Oil Drilling District
"S"	Animal Slaughtering
"G"	Surface Mining District
"RPD"	Residential Planned Development District
"K"	Equinekeeping District
"CA"	Commercial and Artcraft District
"POD"	Pedestrian Oriented District
"CDO"	Community Design Overlay District
"MU"	Mixed Use District
"FH"	Fence Height District
"SN"	Sign District
"RFA"	Residential Floor Area District
"NSO"	Neighborhood Stabilization Overlay District
"CPIO"	Community Plan Implementation Overlay District
"MPR"	<u>Modified Parking Requirement District</u>

The "**Zoning Map**" is amended to indicate these districts and the boundaries of each district.

Land classified in an "O" Oil Drilling District, "S" Animal Slaughtering District, "G" Surface Mining District, "RPD" Residential Planned Development District, "K" Equinekeeping District, "CA" Commercial and Artcraft District, "POD" Pedestrian Oriented District, "CDO" Community Design Overlay District, "MU" Mixed Use District, "FH" Fence Height District, "SN" Sign District, "RFA" Residential Floor Area District, or "NSO" Neighborhood Stabilization Overlay District, "CPIO" Community Plan Implementation Overlay District, or "MPR" Modified Parking Requirement District is also classified in one or more zones, and land classified in the "P" Automobile Parking Zone may also be classified in an "A" or "R" Zone.

These classifications are indicated on the “**Zoning Map**,” with a combination of symbols, e.g., **R2-2-O**, **C2-4-S**, **M1-3-G**, **M1-1-P** and **R2-O**, **C2-G**, etc., where height districts have not been established.

**Sec. 2.** New Subdivision 28 of Subsection X of Section 12.24 of the Los Angeles Municipal Code is added:

**28. Reduced Parking in a Modified Parking Requirement (MPR) District.** A Zoning Administrator may, upon application, permit a reduction in the number of off-street parking spaces required by Section 12.21A.4 for a project located within a Modified Parking Requirement (MPR) District as set forth in Section 13.15.

**Sec. 3.** Subsection K of Section 12.32 of the Los Angeles Municipal Code is deleted:

**~~K. — Parking Restriction District.~~**

~~1. An area may be designated by the Council by ordinance adopted in the manner required for a change of zone or height district as a Parking Restrictions District and provide parking requirements more restrictive than those otherwise required in Paragraph 12.21 A 4 (c) of this Code for the same use, if it meets one or more of the following criteria. In adopting the ordinance the Council shall make the following findings:~~

~~(a) There is a lack of transit service; or~~

~~(b) There is a high potential for spillover parking impacts on adjacent residential areas; or~~

~~(c) There is a low probability that parking management programs, transportation demand management programs, or public parking facilities will be available.~~

~~2. The boundaries of the area shall be accurately defined as a Parking Standards District (PSD) by ordinance, adopted in the same manner as required for a change of zone or height district.~~

~~3. Within a Parking Standards District, the minimum or maximum spaces required for commercial uses and commercial uses within industrial buildings, shall be established in the text of the ordinance.~~

**Sec. 4.** Subsection L of Section 12.32 of the Los Angeles Municipal Code is deleted:

**~~L. Parking Reduction District.~~** ~~An area may be designated by the Council by ordinance as a Parking Reductions District and provide parking requirements less restrictive than those otherwise required in Paragraph 12.21 A 4 (c) of this Code for the same use. In adopting the ordinance the Council shall make the following findings:~~

~~1. A parking overflow impact on residential neighborhoods will not be created nor will traffic congestion increase; and~~

~~2. There exists a combination of parking management programs, transportation alternatives, or other infrastructure improvements, and commercial building access programs, along with a method for City monitoring and ensuring compliance therewith, that negate the need for higher parking requirements; and~~

~~3. Flexible transportation approaches and parking management programs instead of a higher number of fixed parking space requirements are more consistent with the region's air quality goals, community character and general plan of the area than the accommodation of additional automobiles.~~

**Sec. 5.** Subsection S of Section 12.32 of the Los Angeles Municipal Code is amended to read as follows:

**S. Supplemental Use Districts.**

**1. Establishment of Districts.**

(a) **Purpose.** The purpose of this article is to regulate and restrict the location of certain types of uses whose requirements are difficult to anticipate and cannot adequately be provided for in the “**Comprehensive Zoning Plan**”. These uses, the boundaries of the districts where they are permitted, the limitations governing their operations, and the procedure for the establishment of new districts, are provided for in this article. Except for the “**Supplemental Uses**” permitted by this article, all property within the districts hereby established is subject to the provisions of the “**Comprehensive Zoning Plan**”.

(b) **Districts.** In order to carry out the provisions of this article, the following districts are established:

“O”	Oil Drilling District
“S”	Animal Slaughtering District
“G”	Surface Mining District
“RPD”	Residential Planned Development District
“K”	Equinekeeping District
“CA”	Commercial and Artcraft District
“POD”	Pedestrian Oriented District
“CDO”	Community Design Overlay District
“MU”	Mixed Use District
“FH”	Fence Height District
“SN”	Sign District
“RFA”	Residential Floor Area District
“NSO”	Neighborhood Stabilization Overlay District
“CPIO”	Community Plan Implementation Overlay District

“MPR”Modified Parking Requirement District

These districts and their boundaries are shown on portions of the “Zoning Map” as provided for in Section 12.04 and made a part thereof by a combination of the zone and district symbols. This map and the notations, references and other information shown on it, which pertain to the boundaries of these districts are made a part of this article as if fully described here. Reference is hereby made to those maps, notations, references and other information for full particulars.

**Sec 6.** Article 3 of the Los Angeles Municipal Code is amended to read as follows:

## Section

- 13.01 “O” Oil Drilling Districts.
- 13.02 “S” Animal Slaughtering Districts.
- 13.03 “G” Surface Mining Operations Districts.
- 13.04 “RPD” Residential Planned Development Districts.
- 13.05 “K” Equinekeeping Districts.
- 13.06 Commercial and Artcraft Districts.
- 13.07 Pedestrian Oriented District.
- 13.08 “CDO” Community Design Overlay District.
- 13.09 Mixed Use District.
- 13.10 Fence Heights District.
- 13.11 “SN” Sign District.
- 13.12 “NSO” Neighborhood Stabilization Overlay District.
- 13.13 “RFA” Residential Floor Area District.
- 13.14 “CPIO” Community Plan Implementation Overlay District.
- 13.15 “MPR” Modified Parking Requirement District.
- ~~13.15~~ 13.16 Violation.

**Sec. 7.** Section 13.15 of the Los Angeles Municipal Code is added:

**13.15 MODIFIED PARKING REQUIREMENT (MPR) DISTRICT.**

**A. Purpose.** This section sets forth procedures and guidelines for the establishment of Modified Parking Requirement (MPR) Districts to supplement areas of the City that have been identified as having unique parking issues. Reducing parking and providing flexibility in the location of off-street parking will ease traffic congestion, ease the reuse of vacant commercial and industrial space, and enable more affordable housing. Each MPR District will be designated by the City Council by ordinance adopted in the manner required for a change of zone.

**B. Establishment of Districts.** The procedures set forth in Section 12.32 S of the code shall be followed to establish a Modified Parking Requirement (MPR) District. With the exception of the Adaptive Reuse Incentives Areas Specific Plan (Ordinance No. 175,588) and the South Central Alcohol Sales Specific Plan (Ordinance No. 171,681) no MPR District shall be established over an area governed by a specific plan established on or before the effective



date of this ordinance. Within a MPR District, one or more of the strategies listed in Subsection D shall be clearly established within the text of the ordinance.

C. **Size and Boundaries.** An MPR District shall encompass a minimum of two entire block faces, one full city block, or five acres in area and the boundaries shall be accurately defined by ordinance and adopted in the same manner as required for a change of zone or height district.

D. **Initiation.** Initiation or amendment of an MPR District may be at the request of a private applicant, the Director of Planning, the City Planning Commission, or City Council.

E. **Findings.** In addition to the findings set forth in Section 12.32 C-2, the City Planning Commission must find that the District, and the strategies included in the District, are appropriate considering such factors as local transit dependency and automobile usage, traffic, available parking, and level of transit service, and the goals, policies, and objectives set forth in the applicable community plan.

F. **Optional Modified Parking Requirement (MPR) District Strategies.** One or more of the seven strategies listed in this subsection shall be enumerated in the MPR District.

1. **Change of Use Parking Standards.** The required number of parking spaces shall be the same as the number of spaces that existed on the site on the date the Parking Space Modification District is established.

2. **Off-site Parking.** The automobile parking spaces required by Section 12.21 A.4 shall be provided either on the same lot as the use for which they are intended to serve or on another lot within 1500 feet therefrom, guaranteed through a covenant agreement. The said distance is to be measured parallel to any street, alley, public walk, or private easement that allows public pedestrian travel from the parking area to the use it is to serve.

3. **Parking Reduction Permit.** A Parking Reduction Permit, per Section 12.24 X.28, may be initiated to request reductions in parking for individual projects.

4. **Decreased Parking Requirements.** Parking requirements may be less restrictive than those otherwise required in Paragraph 12.21 A 4 of this Code. Each use with modified parking requirements must be itemized with its new parking requirement within the MPR District; otherwise the number of spaces shall be governed by Section 12.21 A 4.

a. **Affordable Housing Incentives.** Required parking for housing development projects, as defined in Section 12.22 A 25(b) of this Code, must be less than the required parking for dwelling units or joint living and work quarters included in any other project.

b. **Rent Stabilization Ordinance.** Required parking for properties with existing dwelling units or existing joint living and work quarters subject to the Rent Stabilization Ordinance or existing, restricted affordable units, as defined in Section 12.22 A 25(b) of this Code, shall not be reduced by the application of an MPR District below what is otherwise required by this Code. For purposes of this provision, “existing”

shall mean units or quarters that existed on the property and were occupied subject to the Rent Stabilization Ordinance or as restricted affordable units anytime after June 30, 2006. Required parking on such properties may however be reduced by the Affordable Housing Incentives – Density Bonus (Ordinance 179,681) and other applicable housing incentive programs.

c. Additional Findings.

(1) A parking overflow impact on residential neighborhoods will not be created nor will traffic congestion increase; and

(2) there exists a combination of parking management programs, transportation alternatives, or other infrastructure improvements, and commercial building access programs, along with a method for City monitoring and ensuring compliance therewith, that negate the need for higher parking requirements; and

(3) flexible transportation approaches and parking management programs instead of a higher number of fixed parking space requirements are more consistent with the region's air quality goals, community character and general plan of the area than the accommodation of additional automobiles.

5. **Increased Parking Requirements.** Parking requirements may be more restrictive than those otherwise required in Paragraph 12.21 A.4 of this Code. Each use with modified parking requirements must be itemized with its new parking requirement within the MPR District; otherwise the number of spaces shall be governed by Section 12.21 A.4.

Additional Findings.

a. There is a lack of transit service; or

b. there is a high potential for spillover parking impacts on adjacent residential areas; or

c. there is a low probability that parking management programs, transportation demand management programs, or public parking facilities will be available.

6. **Commercial Parking Credits.** Parking requirements may be satisfied by the purchase of parking credits. The number of available parking credits shall be established by a survey that denotes the number of underutilized public parking spaces available within the MPR at various times of the day. The parameters of which shall be delineated in the individual MPR District.

7. **Maximum Parking Requirements.** Maximum parking limits may be set. Each use with maximum parking requirements must be itemized with its new parking

requirement within the MPR District; otherwise the number of spaces shall be governed by Section 12.21 A.4.

**Sec. 7.**        The City Clerk shall certify ...