



## STAFF REPORT

**TO:** PLANNING COMMISSION

**FROM:** Corey Simon, Senior Planner *CS*

**DATE:** March 23, 2010

**SUBJECT:** CONTINUED Public hearing to review proposed zoning text amendments to the Martinez Municipal Code Chapter 22.36; Off-Street Parking. Proposed changes include: adjusting the minimum required parking for multi-family residential development; establishing a city-wide requirement for guest parking in multi-family residential development; and modifying the design standards and use restrictions of driveways and garages that are used for required parking. The Planning Commission will make its recommendations to the City Council, which will consider the possible amendments at a future date to be announced.

### RECOMMENDATION:

Adopt PC Resolution No. 10-01 recommending to the City Council adoption of an Ordinance amending the Zoning Ordinance, Title 22, Chapter 36 (Off-Street Parking) of the Martinez Municipal Code.

### BACKGROUND and DISCUSSION:

Based on direction given from the Commission at the February 23, 2010 meeting, staff conducted additional research on the specific parking topics listed below. (The February 23, 2010 staff report is attached for additional background.)

#### **Topic 1: Expanded survey of neighboring cities, and options for guest parking requirements.**

Staff has expanded the attached table of data ("Existing and Proposed Multi-Family Parking Requirements") from neighboring cities to include the Cities of Antioch and Benicia, in addition to the data from Concord, Pleasant Hill, Walnut Creek and Contra Costa County that was presented at the last meeting. Both Antioch and Benicia's requirements are slightly less stringent than the standards being proposed for Martinez, which are summarized on the following page:

**MARTINEZ - MULTI-FAMILY PARKING REQUIREMENTS, PER UNIT, AS PROPOSED**

Dwelling Type	Zoning Districts	Required Parking Spaces Per Dwelling Unit <sup>**</sup>	
		Covered	Open
<b>1 bedroom or less</b>		<b>1</b>	<del>1 1/4</del> 1/2
<b>2 bedrooms or more</b>		<b>1</b>	<del>1 1/4</del> 1

**MARTINEZ- MULTI-FAMILY PARKING REQUIREMENTS, GUEST PARKING AS PROPOSED**

*Guest Parking **for multiple family projects of five or more units: For projects of five or more units, an additional required guest parking space shall be 1/4 parking space if there are over 4 units, above that which is required in Section 22.36.030.A above, shall be provided for each unit.** The total of required guest spaces shall be additive and rounded off to the higher number. The Planning commission may approve tandem guest spaces if it can be found that residents will not be inconvenienced by this arrangement.* [NOTE TO COMMISSION: This 1/4 space requirement would now apply to all multi-family projects of 5 or more units throughout the City, not just in the Downtown overlay.]

Given the data available, staff does not recommend any further changes to the proposed Per Unit parking requirement above. But there does appear to be wider discrepancy between neighboring agencies' requirements for Guest Parking than there is for Per Unit Parking. The agencies' requirements for Guest Parking range from no requirement for additional Guest Parking (Walnut Creek and Benicia) up to 1/2 space per unit (Pleasant Hill). Given the data available, and wide range of standards for Guest Parking applied by neighboring agencies, it does not appear that the need to increase the 1/4 space per unit standard can be readily documented. But should the Commission believe that a more stringent requirement is desirable, a requirement for 0.33 spaces per unit, for projects of five or more units would still be within the range of neighboring agencies' requirements for Guest Parking.

**Topic 2: Means of granting exceptions to parking requirements.**

As per the Commission's direction, staff has expanded the attached table ("Existing and Proposed Multi-Family Parking Requirements") to list the means in which neighboring agencies allow exceptions to their parking requirements. As expected, all agencies allow exceptions for a specific project through the adoption of a Planned Development Zoning District (or equivalent). In addition to the approval of Planned Developments, all agencies allow the granting of exceptions with either the approval of a variance (Concord, Antioch and Contra Costa County) or a use permit (Pleasant Hill, Benicia and Walnut Creek). Notwithstanding how some neighboring agencies have adopted the process of allowing parking exceptions with the granting of a use permit, the Deputy City Attorney does not support the granting of exceptions to parking standards with use permit approval.

The legal concerns are similar to those raised by staff when the Commission was asked back in December 2009 to consider revisions to the City's current practice of granting Planned Development approvals with the granting of use permits. In cases other than where a variance is approved, a City's approval of either a Planned Development or an adjustment to parking standards is essentially a legislative act of amending the zoning code (admittedly for a very small area). And such legislative acts can not be executed with the Zoning Administrator's or Planning Commission's quasi-judicial granting of a use permit; they can only be approved by the legislative body, which is the City Council.

Just as using a use permit to amend zoning standards within a Planned Development is not legally advisable, the use of a use permit to amend parking standards is not advisable. As public agencies approve exceptions to minimum yard and lot size requirements the two most applicable tools to grant exceptions to parking standards are either: a) the use of a variance, where the appropriate findings can be made for a particular site with a specific set of constraints or b) the approval of a Planned Development Zoning District by the legislative body (City Council).

### **Topic 3: Adding limitations and standards for use of tandem parking.**

While it was the Commission's consensus that tandem parking may be permissible in certain situations, the Commission did not wish the code to remain silent on the issue. Based on the direction given to staff at the previous meeting, the following limitations and standards for the use of tandem parking are proposed:

- ***Use of Tandem Parking: Two-car tandem garage spaces may be used to meet the parking requirements of this Section, subject to the following requirements and limitations:***
  1. ***Parking spaces must conform to the dimensional requirements of Section 22.36.080.A.1.***  
[NOTE TO COMMISSION: Each individual parking space within the garage is required to be a minimum of 10' x 20'.]
  2. ***Tandem garage spaces must be assigned for the exclusive use of one unit.***
  3. ***Tandem garage parking may be used for all single-family uses, and multi-family uses subject to the following requirements and limitations:***
    - a. ***Tandem parking for multi-family projects is limited to projects either within the Downtown Overlay District or a Planned Development approved pursuant to Chapter 22.42.***
    - b. ***There must be adequate private driveway area to allow staging of vehicles without use of a public street.***

### **Topic 4: Prohibition of parking RV's in required multi-family parking areas.**

At the last meeting, staff was asked to look at this issue, and research what, if any additional regulations may be appropriate. The City did not include restrictions on the

parking of small RV's within multi-family parking as part of its 2008 adoption of new RV parking rules, as this did not appear to be a problem at the time. While such RV parking still does not appear to be a problem as staff is not aware of incidences where required multi-family parking is taken up by RV's, such restrictions were placed on the parking of RV's within Condominium Subdivisions (Chapter 21.54 of the Subdivision Title) when the City's condominium regulations were first adopted in 1979. These regulations state that unless a prescribed area for RV parking is provided for residents, RV's must be banned from the common interest subdivision. Such a prohibition is to be enforced through the subdivision's CC&R's. The City of Concord has a similar provision in its Condominium regulations.

Given that there has been little interest in condominium development over the last two decades, these types of regulations have gone unnoticed. Rather than drafting a specific regulation for an issue that may not need correcting, it may be more appropriate to consider the inclusion of such bans (again, where on-site RV parking is NOT to be provided by developer) on a case-by-case basis when Planned Development approval entitlements for multi-family projects – including rental and townhome projects– are requested.

**ATTACHMENT:**

- February 23, 2010 Staff Report
- Draft Resolution, with proposed Zoning Text Amendment

**EXHIBITS:**

- Table: "Existing and Proposed Multi-Family Parking Requirements"

F:\Community Development\All Projects\Municipal Code Changes\PARKING STANDARDS - Multi-Family\MFParkingRev-PC-Rpt 2010 03 23.doc



## STAFF REPORT

**TO:** PLANNING COMMISSION

**FROM:** Corey Simon, Senior Planner

**DATE:** February 23, 2010

**SUBJECT:** Public hearing to review proposed zoning text amendments to the Martinez Municipal Code Chapter 22.36; Off-Street Parking. Proposed changes include: adjusting the minimum required parking for multi-family residential development; establishing a city-wide requirement for guest parking in multi-family residential development; and modifying the design standards and use restrictions of driveways and garages that are used for required parking. The Planning Commission will make its recommendations to the City Council, which will consider the possible amendments at a future date to be announced.

### RECOMMENDATION:

Adopt PC Resolution No. 10-01 recommending to the City Council adoption of an Ordinance amending the Zoning Ordinance, Title 22, Chapter 36 (Off-Street Parking) of the Martinez Municipal Code.

### BACKGROUND:

The City's last compressive zoning code update was in 1975. Since that time most of the City's zoning code revisions have been concerned with relatively narrow issues (e.g. recreational vehicle parking restrictions). Over the years, the more broad body of regulations has become increasingly out-of-date and while not necessarily obsolete, some of these regulations and processes hamper the City's ability to efficiently address the review of development applications. Given the built-out nature of Martinez, the problem has become most evident in requests to approve in-fill residential developments. In addition to the two topics already addressed by the Planning Commission in 2009 – Minimum Open Space requirements and Planned Unit Development (PUD) review process – the recent application for the Cascara Canyon multi-family project has lead staff to also revisit the City's multi-family parking requirements. While there has been several multi-family projects built within the Downtown Overlay District, which was established in 1996 with relatively more lenient parking requirements, there has not been any apartment style multi-family construction

in the City since the 1980's. Similar to what was found problematic with the City's current requirements for Outdoor Open Space and Planned Unit Development approval, the current applications have also revealed that the City's requirements for Off-Street Parking for multi-family housing outside the Downtown Overlay District may also be out of sync with actual demand and current best practices.

With the Commission having completed its review and recommendations to the City Council regarding Minimum Open Space requirements and Planned Unit Development review process, its review of multi-family parking requirements will complete the most pressing of desired code updates. Staff intends to bundle the recommended changes to Usable Open Space standards, PUD processing and Off-Street Parking requirements into one enacting ordinance for the City Council's consideration in early 2010.

**DISCUSSION:**

**Topic 1: Background for current Multi-family Parking requirements.**

All of the City's current requirements for multi-family parking were established in 1996, concurrently with the establishment of the Downtown Overlay District. As a predecessor to the more recently adopted 2006 Downtown Specific Plan, the Downtown Overlay District was intended to foster new residential construction in the older downtown area through the application of more lenient development standards than were applied elsewhere in the City. In addition to reducing minimum yard requirements, the Downtown Overlay established multi-family parking requirements that are less demanding than those to be applied elsewhere in the City:

**MULTI-FAMILY PARKING REQUIREMENTS, PER UNIT, AS ESTABLISHED IN 1996, SEC 22.36.080**

		(Covered)	(Open)
<i>Multiple family</i>	<i>All districts except sites included in the Downtown Overlay District</i>	1	1¼
<i>Multiple family</i>	<i>Downtown Overlay District (except projects on streets where bike lanes are proposed)</i>		
<i>studio</i>		1	
<i>1 bedroom</i>		1	½
<i>2+ bedrooms,</i>		1	1

*Guest Parking: Additional required guest parking spaces shall be ¼ space if there are over 4 units. The required guest spaces shall be additive and rounded off to the higher number. The Planning Commission may approve tandem guest spaces if it can be found that residents will not be inconvenienced by this arrangement.*

(NOTE TO PLANNING COMMISSION: Parking requirements within Downtown Overlay may be further reduced to 1 space per unit per Sec. 22.13.030; Conditional Uses in Downtown Overlay District)

A requirement for 2¼ parking spaces for all multi-family units, regardless of the number

of bedrooms, was unusually high even by the standards of the mid 1990's. Prior to the City's adoption of Condominium Subdivision regulations (Title 21, Chapter 54), the City required 1½ spaces per unit for all multi-family construction. The more stringent requirement of 2¼ spaces per unit was most likely established for condominiums as a means of encouraging larger and higher cost ownership units. Most likely for the same reason - to encourage larger more expensive units - the higher standard required was made a requirement for all multi-family construction, except in the newly established Downtown Overlay District, in 1996.

## **Topic 2: Application and shortcomings of current Multi-family Parking requirements.**

Based on the construction activity staff is aware of since 1996, the following observations can be made:

- There has been no apartment style multi-family construction outside of the Downtown Overlay District in over 10 years. While it is unknown to what degree the relatively more demanding parking requirements have played in reducing multi-family construction outside the Downtown Overlay District, it is generally recognized that suburban style multi-family construction peaked in the mid and late 1980's. Factors since then, such as changes in tax laws, interest rates, land availability and other market conditions were all most likely greater influences.
- Recent Cascara Canyon application (2009) has highlighted that the current requirement for 2¼ spaces per unit is out of sync with both actual demand and requirements of neighboring communities. With the onset of the market downturn in the late 2000's, financial conditions appear to have restarted interest in the development of apartment style multi-family construction. The 2009 Cascara Canyon application (Shell Avenue) was the first market rate project in decades to propose a mix of one- and two- bedroom flats, as opposed to what had been the more common two- and three- bedroom townhome configuration. Parking studies done for the Cascara application's environmental analysis places actual parking demand for such multi-family projects in the range of 1.2 to 1.6 spaces per unit. The table provided as "Attachment A" compares the multi-family parking requirements of neighboring jurisdictions, all of which are closer to the observed demand than the City's current City-wide requirement for 2¼ spaces per unit. Also, all other jurisdictions apply parking spaces requirements in proportion to the units' number of bedrooms while the current requirement for 2¼ spaces is applied to all units, regardless of size.
- Non-discretionary parking requirements within Downtown Overlay District (as per 22.36.080, above) rarely applied in practice. While the parking requirements within the Downtown Overlay are more in sync with actual demand and neighboring agencies (studios requiring one space, one-bedroom units requiring 1½ spaces, and two-bedroom units requiring 2 spaces), these provisions have rarely been used, as Section 22.13.030.D allows the Planning Commission to approve parking at a rate of 1 space per unit, regardless of unit size. Since most all development in the

Downtown Overlay requires Use Permit approval to allow the maximum density permitted within the District, and most all development has been subject to Planning Commission review because the higher density often requested, the reduction in parking has been both requested and approved on currently with the desired higher density. It must be stressed that such projects have typically been small, ranging from 3 to 6 units, and in settings where on-street parking would be plentiful. Staff would not recommend extending such a process beyond the Downtown Overlay, where larger projects and/or lack of on-street parking could both be problematic. Other minor observations are:

- “Bikelane” exclusion has not been used. The current Downtown Overlay Parking Requirements are not to be applied “where bike lanes are proposed.” (per Section 22.36.080.C) The 1992 General Plan Circulation Element proposed bike Lanes on Marina Vista Alhambra, Berrellesa, Escobar, and Court/Pine Streets. It appears that it was the City’s intent to apply the Citywide requirement for 2¼ spaces on those streets within the Downtown Overlay where parking lanes were to be removed for bikelanes. At this time, both the Alhambra Avenue and Berrellesa Street bike lane have been installed. Both parking lanes have been retained on Alhambra, but the parking lane has been removed from southbound Berrellesa Street. But this “exclusion” for streets with bike lanes does not apply to the Planning Commission’s ability to approve parking at 1 space per unit, per Section 22.13.030.D. Staff is not aware of a single instance where reduced parking (per Section 22.13.030.D) has not been permitted on Berrellesa Street.
- Studio units have not been built. Staff is not aware of the construction of any studio units either inside or outside of the Downtown Overlay district.

**Topic 3: Recommended changes to Multi-family Parking requirements.**

Based on the above observations, staff is recommending that the parking requirements for both City-wide and Downtown Overlay District be simplified and consolidated as outlined below (the Planning Commission’s ability to approve one space per unit in the Downtown Overlay per Section 22.13.030.D would be unaffected.). The complete text of the proposed regulations is provided as Exhibit 1 of “Attachment B,” a draft resolution recommending approval to City Council:

**MULTI-FAMILY PARKING REQUIREMENTS, PER UNIT, AS PROPOSED**

Dwelling Type	Zoning Districts	Required Parking Spaces Per Dwelling Unit**	
		Covered	Open
Multiple family	All districts except sites included in	1	1¼

the Downtown Overlay  
District

<b>1 bedroom or less</b>	<b>1</b>	<del>1 1/4</del> <b>1/2</b>
<b>2 bedrooms or more</b>	<b>1</b>	<del>1 1/4</del> <b>1</b>

<i>Multiple family<sup>2</sup></i>	<i>Downtown Overlay District (except projects on streets where bike lanes are proposed)</i>	
<i>studio</i>	<i>1</i>	
<i>1 bedroom</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>1/2</i>
<i>2+ bedrooms,</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>1</i>

**Guest Parking for multiple family projects of five or more units:** For projects of five or more units, an additional required guest parking space shall be 1/4 parking space if there are over 4 units, above that which is required in Section 22.36.030.A above, shall be provided for each unit. The total of required guest spaces shall be additive and rounded off to the higher number. The Planning commission may approve tandem guest spaces if it can be found that residents will not be inconvenienced by this arrangement. [NOTE TO COMMISSION: This 1/4 space requirement would now apply to all multi-family projects of 5 or more units throughout the City, not just in the Downtown overlay.

**Topic 4: Other Recommended technical changes to Parking Requirements.**

While staff is unable to conduct a comprehensive review and update of all parking regulations at this time, the two topics below are integral to the residential Parking Table in Section 22.36.030, and should be clarified at this time (again, Exhibit 1 of "Attachment B" contains the complete text).

- Ability to use driveways for required parking very limited. A current note at the bottom of the table states "Driveways shall not be counted as part of any required parking." While such a regulation is common, staff is aware that some confusion has arisen over the years as to the status of the "open driveway space" in front of garages in the Downtown Overlay District. At times, these spaces have been counted toward meeting required parking per Section 22.36.030. Staff has proposed the following clarification, so only those spaces not within the front and street-side yards may be counted.

**Driveways that are either within a minimum required front or street-side side yard, or serve more than one unit, shall not be counted as part of any required Open parking pursuant to this Section.**

Such a clarification would be especially relevant to owners of older single-family homes within the Downtown area, where the requirement for 2/off-street parking spaces is often met with a small single car at the rear corner of the property, and a long driveway within the side yard.

- Use and size of garages. The City's current regulation on the use of garages for car storage currently is limited to multi-family development. It is also inconsistent with

the standard language the City has been placing within the CC&R's of residential subdivisions. The City Attorney recommends the following modification, which would apply to all garages, for both single- and multi-family residential uses:

~~Garages shall not be used for storage by any outside party nor used for habitation by any party. There shall be at all times in every garage in the City sufficient space to park at least one automobile.~~ **Any garages needed to provide the Covered parking space requirements of this Section shall, at all times, be maintained in a manner which permits the parking therein of the number of vehicles for which the garage was designed.**

Staff is also proposing a similar clarification to the dimensional requirements for garages in Section 22.36.080.A, as "covered" is not required to be within a garage. The requirements for garage dimensions do, however, apply to those garages.

*Each parking space shall be not less than 20 feet in length and 9 feet in width exclusive of aisles and access drives, except that a **required covered** parking space **per Section 22.36.030.A; Parking Residential Use** ~~required to be~~ located in an enclosed garage shall be not less than 20 feet in length and 10 feet in width, exclusive of utility areas.*

**ATTACHMENT:**

Draft Resolution, with proposed Zoning Text Amendment

F:\Community Development\All Projects\Municipal Code Changes\PKING STANDARDS - Multi-Family\MFParkingRev-PC-Rpt 2010 02 23.doc

**RESOLUTION NO. PC #10-01 [ DRAFT ]**

**A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION  
OF THE CITY OF MARTINEZ,  
RECOMMENDING THE CITY COUNCIL ADOPT AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE  
ZONING ORDINANCE, TITLE 22, CHAPTER 36 ("OFF-STREET PARKING") OF THE  
MARTINEZ MUNICIPAL CODE RELATING TO MINIMUM REQUIRED PARKING FOR  
MULTI-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT; REQUIREMENT FOR GUEST  
PARKING IN MULTI-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT; AND DESIGN  
STANDARDS AND USE RESTRICTIONS OF DRIVEWAYS AND GARAGES**

**WHEREAS**, Section 22.36.010 of the Martinez Municipal Code states that the major purpose of establishing off-street parking requirements is to alleviate or to prevent traffic congestion and shortages of on-street parking; and

**WHEREAS**, off-street parking spaces are to be provided, as prescribed by Chapter 36, incidental to the development of new land uses and the enlargement of existing land uses; and

**WHEREAS**, the purpose statement of Chapter 36 states that the number of spaces to be prescribed by the Chapter is to be in proportion to the need for such facilities as created by the particular type of land use; and

**WHEREAS**, the current parking space requirement for multi-family development, other than for development within the Downtown Overlay District, is for 2¼ spaces per multi-family unit, regardless of unit size; and

**WHEREAS**, the current parking requirement for single family homes is for 2 spaces per unit; and

**WHEREAS** the current requirement for 2¼ spaces per multi-family unit was established in 1996 when the anticipated type of multi-family development was envisioned to be larger units with multiple bedrooms, rather than for smaller studio and one-bedroom units; and

**WHEREAS**, the requirement for 2¼ spaces per unit is proportional to the demand for parking of larger multi-family units with multiple bedrooms, which is similar to the demand for parking of single-family homes; and

**WHEREAS**, in 1996, a relaxed off-street parking standard was adopted for multi-family development in the Downtown Overlay District, requiring 1 space per studio unit and 1½ spaces for one-bedroom units; and

**WHEREAS;** the application of less stringent parking requirements within the Downtown Overlay District was both a reflection of the anticipated demand for studio and one-bedroom units within the Downtown Overlay area, and was intended to serve as an incentive for such residential development to occur within the Downtown Overlay District; and;

**WHEREAS,** since 1996, several multi-family projects with one-bedroom units have been built within the Downtown Overlay District, while no multi-family project with units of less than two-bedroom size have been built outside of the Downtown Overlay District; and

**WHEREAS,** since the recent economic downturn, the market viability and developer interest in constructing multi-family projects outside the Downtown Overlay District with one-bedroom units has risen; and

**WHEREAS,** an application to allow the construction of a multi-family development with a majority of one-bedroom units was made in March 2009, which included a request for an exception to the requirement for 2¼ parking spaces per unit; and;

**WHEREAS,** an Initial Study and Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration was prepared for the project, which included an analysis of estimated parking demand for the proposed multi-family units. The City's consultant traffic engineer measured actual parking demand for similar multi-family developments in the neighboring City of Concord, and found demand ranging from 1.17 to 1.64 spaces per unit; and

**WHEREAS,** a review of neighboring Agencies' multi-family parking requirements shows requirements for one-bedroom units are typically 1½ spaces per unit, with guest parking requirements ranging from ¼ to ½ space per unit; and

**WHEREAS,** the City's current requirement for 2¼ spaces for all multi-family units thus appears inconsistent with the intent of Chapter 36, regarding parking requirements being in proportion to the need for such facilities as created by the particular type of land use; and

**WHEREAS,** staff anticipates that given the declining economic climate for larger units and ownership housing, an increase in applications for more multi-family development with smaller units can be anticipated; and

**WHEREAS,** should those applications be made, it would not be reasonable for every applicant to request an exception to parking standards that appears to be disproportional to actual demand; and

**WHEREAS,** the proposed revisions to multi-family parking requirements would make such regulations more proportional to the actual demands for resident and guest parking both inside and outside of the Downtown Overlay District; and

**WHEREAS**, staff has proposed an update of driveway and garage use restriction to likewise be consistent with actual usage, and the restrictions currently required by similar agencies; and

**WHEREAS**, the adoption of the proposed text amendments is categorically exempt from the requirements of CEQA, under Section 15305 (Minor Alterations in Land Use Limitations) of the CEQA Guidelines; and

**WHEREAS**, the Planning Commission held a public hearing on February 23, 2010, and listened to testimony from the public.

**WHEREAS**, the Planning Commission voted unanimously to continue the item to the Planning Commission meeting of March 23, 2010, to allow staff time to gather additional research and conduct additional analysis.

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** that the Planning Commission hereby recommends that the City Council adopt an ordinance amending Title 22, Zoning Ordinance of the Martinez Municipal Code to incorporate said revisions as set forth in Exhibit A, attached hereto and incorporated herein by this reference.

\* \* \* \* \*

**I HEREBY CERTIFY** that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of a resolution duly adopted by the Planning Commission of the City of Martinez at a regular meeting of said Commission held on the 23<sup>rd</sup> day of March, 2010 by the following vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

ABSTAINED:

BY: \_\_\_\_\_  
Lynette Busby  
Planning Commission Chair

\_\_\_\_\_  
Corey M. Simon  
Senior Planner

3m

# EXHIBIT A

PLANNING COMMISSION RESOLUTION 10-01 (DRAFT); MARCH 23, 2010

## MULTI-FAMILY PARKING – 2010.03.23 - DRAFT CHANGES

PROPOSED NEW CODE (as presented to Commission on February 23, 2010) SHOWN AS: **Proposed new rules; subsequent changes for meeting of March 23, 2010 shown as Proposed new rules**

PROPOSED DELETED CODE SHOWN AS: Text to be deleted

### 22.36.030 Parking--Residential Uses.

**A** Parking shall be provided for residential development in accordance with the following table:

**RESIDENTIAL USES TABLE**

Dwelling Type	Zoning Districts	Required Parking Spaces Per Dwelling Unit <sup>22</sup>	
		Covered	Open
<b>A1.</b> Single family	All districts except R-1.5, R-2.5 and R-3.5	2	0
Single family	R-1.5, R-2.5 and R-3.5	1	1
<b>B2.</b> Multiple family <sup>2</sup>	All districts except sites included in the Downtown Overlay District	1	1 1/4
<b>1 bedroom or less</b>		<b>1</b>	<del>1 1/4</del> 1/2
<b>2 bedrooms or more</b>		<b>1</b>	<del>1 1/4</del> <b>1</b>
<b>C.</b> Multiple family <sup>2</sup>	Downtown Overlay District (except projects on streets where bike lanes are proposed)		
studio		1	
1 bedroom		1	1/2
2+ bedrooms,		1	1

Guest Parking **for multiple family projects of five or more units: For projects of five or more units, an additional required guest parking space shall be 1/4 parking space if there are over 4 units, above that which is required in Section 22.36.030.A above, shall be provided for each unit.** The **total of** required guest spaces shall be additive and rounded off to the higher number. The Planning commission may approve tandem guest spaces if it can be found that residents will not be inconvenienced by this arrangement. [NOTE TO

COMMISSION: This ¼ space requirement would now apply to all multi-family projects of 5 or more units throughout the City, not just in Downtown overlay.

<b>3.D.</b> Lodging houses, apartment hotels, motels and private clubs providing sleeping accommodations.	All districts	The greater of 1 <b>covered or open</b> space per guest room or 1 <b>covered or open</b> space per 2 beds
<b>4.</b> Subsidized or assisted senior citizen housing.	All districts	.35 <b>covered or open</b> spaces per dwelling unit

~~Note: Additional off-street parking may be required in amounts to be determined by the Planning Commission. [NOTE TO COMMISSION: In the original 1975 code, this comment was only applicable to single-family subdivisions in the R-1.5, R-2.5 and R-3.5 district, when at that time, only one parking space per single-family unit was required. This "Note" no longer seems applicable, as two spaces per unit are now required. Staff recommends removal]~~

~~\* — Garages shall not be used for storage by any outside party nor used for habitation by any party. There shall be at all times in every garage in the City sufficient space to park at least one automobile. [NOTE TO COMMISSION: This "note" codified the sub-section "C" below, and made applicable to all residential garages used to meet requirement for covered parking, not just those within multiple-family development]~~

~~\*\* Off-street, screened and fenced parking for recreational vehicles may be required in amounts to be determined by the Planning Commission for all projects in excess of 10 dwelling units. [NOTE TO COMMISSION: This "note" codified the sub-section "D"]~~

~~For subsidized or assisted senior citizen housing, there shall be a minimum of .35 parking spaces per dwelling unit. [NOTE TO COMMISSION: Parking requirements for "subsidized or assisted senior citizen housing" codified within sub-section "A" above, a distinct Dwelling Type under Section 22.36.030.A.4]~~

**B Use of driveways to meet minimum parking space requirements of this Section:** Driveways that are either within a minimum required front or street-side side yard, or serve more than one unit, shall not be counted as part of any required Open parking pursuant to this Section.

**C Restriction on use of garages:** Garages shall not be used for storage by any outside party nor used for habitation by any party. There shall be at all times in every garage in the City sufficient space to park at least one automobile. Any garages needed to provide the Covered parking space requirements of this Section shall, at all times, be maintained in a manner which permits the parking therein of the number of vehicles for which the garage was designed.

**D Ability for Planning Commission to require RV parking facilities:** Off-street, screened and fenced parking for recreational vehicles may be required in amounts to be determined by the Planning Commission for all projects in excess of 10 dwelling units.

**E Use of Tandem Parking:** Two-car tandem garage space may be used to meet the parking requirements of this Section, subject to the following requirements and limitations:

**1. Parking spaces must conform to the dimensional requirements of Section 22.36.080.A.1.**

**2. Tandem garage spaces must be assigned for the exclusive use of one unit.**

**3. Tandem garage parking may be used for all single-family uses, and multi-family uses subject to the following requirements and limitations:**

**a. Tandem parking for multi-family projects is limited to projects either within the Downtown Overlay District or a Planned Development approved pursuant to Chapter 22.42.**

**b. There must be adequate private driveway area to allow staging of vehicles without use of a public street.**

**22.36.080 Parking--Design Criteria.**

A. Off-street parking facilities provided in compliance with this chapter shall meet the following design and dimension criteria:

1. Each parking space shall be not less than 20 feet in length and 9 feet in width exclusive of aisles and access drives, except that a **required covered** parking space **per Section 22.36.030.A; Parking Residential Use** required to be located in an enclosed garage shall be not less than 20 feet in length and 10 feet in width, exclusive of utility areas.

\* \* \*

F:\Community Development\All Projects\Municipal Code Changes\PARKING STANDARDS - Multi-Family\MFParkingRev-PC Reso 2010 03 23.doc

**EXISTING AND PROPOSED MULTI-FAMILY PARKING REQUIREMENTS**

Planning Commission – March, 23, 2010

PUBLIC AGENCY	REQUIRED PARKING		GUEST SPACES (PER UNIT)	TOTAL (PER UNIT)	EXCEPTIONS PERMITTED BY	NOTES
	REQUIRED PER UNIT COVERED	REQUIRED PER UNIT UNCOVERED				
<b>City of Concord (?)</b>						
Studio	1	0.5	none to 0.33 <sup>(1)</sup>	1.5-1.83	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Variance</li> <li>Planned Development Zoning District</li> </ul>	<sup>(1)</sup> Guest parking only mandated where "primary access <is> along private drives or public streets which no parking is allowed or feasible." but staff typically requests guest parking as part of Planned Development approval
1 bedroom						
2+ bedroom		1		2-2.33		
<b>City of Pleasant Hill (1996)</b>						
Studio	1	0.5	0.50	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Use Permit – survey data from applicant required.</li> <li>Planned Development Zoning District</li> </ul>	
1 bedroom						
2+ bedroom		1		2.5		
<b>City of Antioch (1994)</b>						
up to 2 bedroom	1	0.5	0.20	1.7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Variance</li> <li>Planned Development Zoning District</li> </ul>	
3+ bedroom		1		2.2		
<b>City of Benicia (1987)</b>						
Studio	1	0.2 <sup>(2)</sup>	(none) <sup>(2)</sup>	1.2 <sup>(2)</sup>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Use Permit – survey data from applicant required.</li> <li>Planned Development Zoning District</li> </ul>	<sup>(2)</sup> No more than one parking space shall be reserved for the exclusive use of an individual unit unless additional parking is provided above the amount required by BMC
1 & 2 bedroom		0.5 <sup>(2)</sup>		1.5 <sup>(2)</sup>		
3+ bedroom		1 <sup>(2)</sup>		2 <sup>(2)</sup>		
<b>City of Walnut Creek (?)</b>						
<b>1. General requirements</b>						
Studio	1	0.25		1.25	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Use Permit – survey data from applicant required.</li> <li>Planned Development Zoning District</li> </ul>	
1 bedroom		0.5		1.5		
2 bedroom		1		2		
3+ bedroom		1.25		2.25		
<b>2. Within ½ mile of BART Station<sup>(3)</sup></b>						
Studio	1	(none)	(none)	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Use Permit – survey data from applicant required.</li> <li>Planned Development Zoning District</li> </ul>	<sup>(3)</sup> ½ mile distance is measured from any portion of the subject parcel to the closest point of the Walnut Creek or Pleasant Hill BART Station, "measured along street frontages using the most direct, legally permissible path."
1 bedroom		0.25		1.25		
2 bedroom		0.5		1.5		
3+ bedroom		1		2		
<b>County of Contra Costa (?)</b>						
Studio		1 <sup>(4)</sup>	0.25	1.25	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Variance</li> <li>Planned Development Zoning District</li> </ul>	<sup>(4)</sup> There is no "per unit" requirement for covered parking, however "½ of the <total> required spaces shall be covered."
1 bedroom		1.5 <sup>(4)</sup>		1.75		
2+ bedroom		2 <sup>(4)</sup>		2.25		
<b>CITY of MARTINEZ</b>						
<b>1. General requirements</b>						
(ALL UNITS)	1	1.25	(none)	2.25	(SEE BELOW)	
<b>2a. Within Downtown Overlay Dist.<sup>(5)</sup> (ministerially permitted)</b>						
Studio	1	(none)	0.25 <sup>(6)</sup>	1.25	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Variance (City wide and Downtown Overlay District)</li> <li>Planned Development</li> <li>Use Permit (Only within Downtown Overlay District, with standards and findings specific to Downtown Overlay)</li> </ul>	<sup>(5)</sup> The reduced requirements for projects within the Downtown Overlay District are not to be applied to "projects on streets where bike lanes are proposed." <sup>(6)</sup> The existing and proposed requirements for .25 guest spaces per unit is only applicable to projects "over 4 units."
1 bedroom		0.5		1.75		
2+ bedroom		1		2.25		
<b>2b. Within Downtown Overlay Dist. (WITH USE PERMIT APPROVAL)</b>						
(ALL UNITS)	1	(none)	(none)	1	(SEE ABOVE)	
<b>CITY of MARTINEZ - PROPOSED REVISIONS</b>						
to replace both "General Requirements" & "Downtown Overlay" (ministerial)						
1 bedroom, or less	1	0.5	0.25 <sup>(6)</sup>	1.75	(EXCEPTIONS AS ALLOWED PER EXISTING CODE)	<sup>(6)</sup> The existing and proposed requirements for .25 guest spaces per unit is only applicable to projects "over 4 units."
2 bedroom, or more		1		2.25		

**NOTE: NONE OF THE ABOVE HAVE PRESCRIBED STANDARDS FOR TANDEM PARKING WITHIN ZONING CODE TANDEM PARKING HAS BEEN REVIEWED AND APPROVED AS INDIVIDUAL PLANNED DEVELOPMENTS**