



DOWNTOWN SPECIFIC PLAN DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS PART 2: PARKING

PLANNING COMMISSION
CITY OF SOUTH PASADENA

JUNE 9, 2020



MEETING OBJECTIVES

- Summary of May Meeting Discussion
 - Building Height
 - Densities/Intensities
 - Building Location on Sites (Setbacks, Build-To Lines)
 - Building Typologies
- Review and Receive Feedback for Specific Plan Development Standards
 - Parking





The **Downtown Specific Plan** establishes the following standards for new development:

- Building Placement
- Allowed Building Intensity, Density, Types, and Site Size
- **Parking**
- Frontages and Encroachments
- Building Standards (Allowable Types/Typologies)
- Streets, Blocks, and Open Spaces
- Landscape Standards
- Signs and Other Standards

Topics in blue were discussed at the May 12 meeting and general directions will be reviewed tonight. **Our focus tonight will be on the topic in yellow.**





Review of Planning Commissioners Discussion of Development Standards at May 12, 2020 Meeting

- 1. Building Height**
- 2. Density/Intensity**
- 3. Building Locations on Sites**
- 4. Building Typologies**





Summary of Planning Commissioners Discussion

General

- Standards need to reflect and maintain the existing character of South Pasadena.
- Differentiate development standards to recognize the unique characteristics of Mission Streets and Fair Oaks Avenue.





Summary of Planning Commissioners Discussion

Building Height

- No change at this time pending discussion of the need to accommodate additional units in the ongoing update of the Housing Element. The City Council liaison requests the Commission to make a recommendation for height for its consideration.
- Building height standards should acknowledge that the amount of infill development will be limited and, consequently, should recognize and reflect the prevailing scale and heights of existing buildings. “Keep the heights as low as feasible.”
- General support for adding a standard for the horizontal stepback of the upper floor of buildings.
- Should also consider requiring stepbacks of building abutting adjoining residential neighborhoods to avoid a “blank wall.”
- Diagrams depicting building heights for Mission Street should be revised for consistency with the standards.



Summary of Planning Commissioners Discussion

Density/Intensity

- Comments that the DTSP's standards should be modified to be more realistic, reducing the maximum floor area ratio (FAR) from 2.5 to 1.8 - 2.0 and increasing the maximum housing density (units per acre) from 32 to 50 or more in consideration of analyses comparing standards for building height with intensities /densities that could be achieved.

[Both revisions are consistent with the Commission's recent deliberations on proposed projects in the DTSP area and provide some additional housing capacity in meeting Housing Element Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) targets]

- Should not encourage a large number of small units.

[Note: Should standards be established for unit size and how would these affect the ability to achieve RHNA targets?]

- Comments that the Community Benefits are not sufficient as the basis for permitting increases in building heights above base standards. Some of these should be required, while others need to be strengthened and more specific (e.g., specify a percentage increase for affordable housing units allowing an increase in height).



Summary of Planning Commissioners Discussion

Building Location on Sites

- For Fair Oaks Avenue, standards should allow for variation and modulation of building frontages to avoid the sense of a continuous, undifferentiated “wall.” “Cut-outs” should be considered for landscape, outdoor dining, walkways, and other purposes.

[Note: A continuous building wall frontage on Mission Street is a characteristic of the area and visually appears to be modulated by smaller property widths with multiple businesses and entries]

- Comment supporting increased landscape along building frontages on Mission Street.

[Note: A continuous building wall frontage on Mission Street is a characteristic of the area and visually appears to be modulated by smaller property widths with multiple businesses and entries]





Summary of Planning Commissioners Discussion

Building Typologies

- Though there was minimum discussion, there was general consensus that the building typology descriptions and design standards are appropriate.



Policy Framework for Parking Standards:
Parking standards specified by the Draft Downtown Specific Plan (November 2019) are intended to implement the policies and actions contained in the Draft GP and DTSP, as presented on the following slides.

- Based on the draft Plan, do the standards for parking reflect the intended character for the Downtown Specific Plan area?



General Plan Policy Framework for Standards

A2.2a Leverage locational strengths to reduce cost of new infill development. These should include innovative parking strategies such as districtwide parking management, elimination of parking minimums in target areas, decoupling parking requirements from development sites, and creating shared parking resources among proximate properties and/or public facilities.

[Note: Analysis and inventory of existing parking to be conducted next year as input for development of a parking management plan]

A2.9b Explore metered on-street parking on shopping streets.

A2.9c Consider reducing or eliminating on-site parking requirements on shopping streets to foster financial feasibility for developers and businesses, and establish a resident and employee Preferential Parking District to balance parking needs of businesses with nearby residents.

A4.1e Encourage and/or require the provision of secure bicycle parking facilities at employment centers, commercial centers, recreational amenities, and civic amenities.

P4.13 Provide alternatives to mandated parking minimums and explore opportunities to increase availability of public parking through private development.



General Plan Policy Framework for Standards

A2.2a Leverage locational strengths to reduce cost of new infill development. These should include innovative **parking strategies** such as **districtwide parking management**, **elimination of parking minimums in target areas**, **decoupling parking requirements from development sites**, and **creating shared parking resources** among proximate properties and/or public facilities.

[Note: Analysis and inventory of existing parking to be conducted next year as input for development of a parking management plan]

A2.9b **Explore metered on-street parking** on shopping streets.

A2.9c Consider **reducing or eliminating on-site parking requirements** on shopping streets to foster financial feasibility for developers and businesses, and establish a resident and employee **Preferential Parking District** to balance parking needs of businesses with nearby residents.

A4.1e Encourage and/or require the provision of **secure bicycle parking** facilities at employment centers, commercial centers, recreational amenities, and civic amenities.

P4.13 Provide **alternatives to mandated parking minimums** and explore opportunities to **increase availability of public parking through private development**.



Specific Plan Policy Framework for Standards

Policies and Actions providing general direction of parking development standards:

A2.6a Engage the development community and property owners to promote the redevelopment of single-use and single-story retail centers on Fair Oaks Avenue into mixed-use projects with shared parking.

A2.7b Explore metered on-street parking on shopping streets.

A2.7c Consider reducing on-site parking requirements on shopping streets to leverage transit access and to incentivize potential office and multi-family residential mixed-use development.

A2.7d Conduct a district-wide parking needs assessment to reevaluate need for the Mission Street Specific Plan Parking Density Bonus.

A4.8a Take a flexible and creative approach to parking requirements in new development, providing alternatives to mandated parking minimums and looking for opportunities to increase availability of public parking through private development.



Specific Plan Policy Framework for Standards

Policies and Actions providing general direction of parking development standards:

A2.6a Engage the development community and property owners to promote the redevelopment of single-use and single-story retail centers on Fair Oaks Avenue into mixed-use projects with **shared parking**.

A2.7b **Explore metered on-street parking** on shopping streets.

A2.7c Consider **reducing on-site parking requirements** on shopping streets to leverage transit access and to incentivize potential office and multi-family residential mixed-use development.

A2.7d Conduct a **district-wide parking needs assessment** to reevaluate need for the Mission Street Specific Plan Parking Density Bonus.

A4.8a Take a flexible and creative approach to parking requirements in new development, providing **alternatives to mandated parking minimums** and looking for opportunities to **increase availability of public parking through private development**.



Specific Plan Policy Framework for Standards

Policies and Actions directing specific parking development standards:

A4.8c In the Downtown Specific Plan area, reduce the minimum parking requirement for multifamily residential requirement, two-bedroom or larger units, from 2 spaces per unit to 1.5 spaces per unit, and require “unbundling,” under which parking spaces must be sold or leased separately from units.

A4.8d In the Downtown Specific Plan area, reduce the minimum parking requirements for research and development, offices and laboratories and for offices, administrative, corporate from 3 spaces per 1,000 square feet of gross floor area to 2.5 spaces per 1,000 square feet.

A4.8e In the Downtown Specific Plan area, amend the code for restaurant—not part of multi-tenant retail site or building so that for new uses occupying an existing space of any size (rather than 1,200 square feet or less), no new parking is required.



Specific Plan Policy Framework for Standards

Policies and Actions directing specific parking development standards:

A4.8c In the Downtown Specific Plan area, **reduce** the minimum parking **requirement for multifamily** residential requirement, two-bedroom or larger units, from **2 spaces per unit** to **1.5 spaces per unit**, and **require “unbundling,”** under which parking spaces must be sold or leased separately from units.

A4.8d In the Downtown Specific Plan area, reduce the minimum parking requirements for research and development, offices and laboratories and for offices, administrative, corporate from **3 spaces per 1,000 square feet** of gross floor area to **2.5 spaces per 1,000 square feet**.

A4.8e In the Downtown Specific Plan area, **amend the code for restaurant**—not part of multi-tenant retail site or building so that for new uses occupying an existing space of any size (rather than 1,200 square feet or less), **no new parking is required**.



Specific Plan Policy Framework for Standards

Policies and Actions directing specific parking development standards:

A4.8c In the Downtown Specific Plan area, **reduce** the minimum parking **requirement for multifamily** residential requirement, two-bedroom or larger units, from **2 spaces per unit** to **1.5 spaces per unit**, and **require “unbundling,”** under which parking spaces must be sold or leased separately from units.

A4.8d In the Downtown Specific Plan area, reduce the minimum parking requirements for research and development, offices and laboratories and for offices, administrative, corporate from **3 spaces per 1,000 square feet** of gross floor area to **2.5 spaces per 1,000 square feet**.

A4.8e In the Downtown Specific Plan area, **amend the code for restaurant**—not part of multi-tenant retail site or building so that for new uses occupying an existing space of any size (rather than 1,200 square feet or less), **no new parking is required**.

For Planning Commission consideration:

- *Revise the Parking Standards to incorporate those stipulated in the two previous **highlighted Actions**, or delete the Actions deleted for consistency.*
- *Revise A4.8e as follows: “Do not require new parking to be provided for adaptive reuse of existing buildings that are not part of a multi-tenant retail site or building.”*



Considerations for Possible Modification of Parking Standards

- Existing parking standards reflect the auto-orientation and lack of transit proximity common to other commercial districts in the City and do not reflect visions for downtown as a distinct place where people would walk, bicycle, and use transit more frequently; park in shared structures and once to access multiple businesses.
- Reduced parking supports the use of alternative modes and contributes to the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions.
- Research indicates that more trips to active, pedestrian-oriented mixed-use community centers, such as envisioned for downtown South Pasadena, are being accommodated by ride-sharing services such as Uber and Lyft and, coupled with the future use of autonomous vehicles, are likely to lessen the need for parking spaces.
- Parking once in shared facilities contributes to a more active pedestrian environment along street frontages allowing for the continuity of buildings where curb cuts, drive-ways, and surface parking lots are minimized.



Considerations for Possible Modification of Parking Standards

- Reduction or unbundling of required on-site parking can improve the affordability of multi-family housing and mixed-use development projects, where the typical construction cost for a parking space in a structure is \$28,000 to \$45,000 and more.

[Unbundled parking refers to the practice of selling or leasing of parking spaces separate from the purchase or lease of the residential or commercial use]





Parking Standards: Mission Street Zone

4.1 MISSION STREET ZONE

4.1A. Purpose

The Mission Street Zone permits community serving retail, office, cultural, and transit-oriented residential mixed-uses. Uses include small-scale commercial activities that are typically located along the main street. The standards in this zone are intended to promote a walkable, diverse, and well-connected area.

4.1D. Parking

- i Required Parking
 - a Residential uses

Studio or 1 bedroom	1 space per unit
2+ bedroom	1.5 spaces per unit
 - b Non-residential uses

2 spaces per 1,000 sq.ft.

Larger developments may reduce portion of the required parking in exchange for implementation of trip reduction measures. See Section 4.4.

- ii Parking Placement: On-site parking and access shall be located in compliance with the following requirements:

Setback

- a Primary street min.30 ft.
- b Side street min. 15 ft.
- c Side property min. 5 ft.
- d Rear property/rear alley min. 5 ft.

Parking requirements may be revised to reflect the findings and recommendations of a Parking Management Plan for the Downtown Specific Plan Area.





Parking Standards: Fair Oaks Avenue Zone

4.2 FAIR OAKS AVENUE ZONE

4.2A. Purpose

The Fair Oak Avenue Zone permits regional and community serving retail, office, cultural, and residential mixed-uses. Uses include larger-scale commercial uses that are typically located along busy commercial street. The standards in this zone are intended to promote a walkable, diverse, and well-connected area. The buildings located along the edges that back-up to residential districts require very careful residential scale massing and articulation.

4.2D. Parking

- i Required Parking
 - a Residential uses

Studio or 1 bedroom	1 space per unit
2+ bedroom	1.5 spaces per unit
 - b Non-residential uses

2 spaces per 1,000 sq.ft.

Larger developments may reduce portion of the required amount of parking in exchange for implementation of trip reduction measures. See Section 4.4.

- ii Parking Placement: On-site parking and access shall be located in compliance with the following requirements:

Setback

- a Primary street min. 30 ft.
- b Side street min. 15 ft.
- c Side property min. 5 ft.
- d Rear property/rear alley min. 5 ft.

Parking requirements may be revised to reflect the findings and recommendations of a Parking Management Plan for the Downtown Specific Plan Area.





Comparison of Parking Standards

	Zoning Code	Mission Street SP Core	Draft Downtown SP
Commercial	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Most uses: 4 spaces/1K GSF • Less intensive types of commercial uses (e.g., appliance stores and copy centers): 2 spaces/1K GSF 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 4 spaces/1K GSF • 3 spaces/1K GSF if central parking for 150+ vehicles • Bicycles: 1 secure spaces/4 auto spaces 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2 spaces/1K • Up to 25% reductions for projects with 50+ required spaces: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 spaces/1 electrical vehicle • 1 space/5 shared bicycles • 1 space/5 monthly transit passes
Residential	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 bedroom: 1 space • 2+ bedrooms: 2 spaces, plus 1 guest space/2 units 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 bedroom: 1 space (not tandem) • 2+ bedrooms: 2 spaces (may be tandem) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Studio and 1 bedroom: 1 space • 2+ bedrooms: 1.5 space/unit (unbundling required per policy)
Restaurant	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10 spaces/1K GSF 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10 spaces/1K GSF 	Defaults to MSSP and Zoning Code
Fast Food	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 20 spaces/1K GSF 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 12 spaces/1K GSF 	Defaults to MSSP for Core Area and Zoning Code for remaining area
Historic	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Only as much parking as can be accommodated to rear of the building 		



Questions for Planning Commissioners Consideration

1. Should the parking standards be modified further for uses developed in proximity to the Metro Gold Line station to take advantage of transit ridership, either by reducing the minimums or establishing maximums?

[Note that the latter is a common practice for transit-oriented development projects in many other cities]

2. Should parking that is required for projects in proximity to the Metro Gold Line station be required to be located in shared structures?
3. Would establishing maximum parking standards in lieu of minimums be appropriate in other areas of downtown?
4. Are there additional criteria for which parking reductions would be permitted?
5. Should the parking standards for restaurants default to the existing Code's requirements for commercial districts or be revised to be reflect intentions to uniquely reflect visions for the downtown?

(Restaurants: 10 spaces/1K GSF for restaurants and 20 spaces/1K for both Code and MSSP; Fast Food: 20 spaces/1K GSF for Code and 12 spaces/1K GSF for MSSP)



Questions for Planning Commissioners Consideration

6. Should the parking standards be amended directing that no new parking would be required when a new use occupies an existing space of any size (rather than 1,200 square feet or less) that is not part of a multi-tenant retail site or building to be consistent with *SP A4.8e* ?
7. Should the parking standards be amended directing that the minimum parking requirements for research and development, offices and laboratories and for offices, administrative, corporate be reduced from 3 spaces per 1,000 square feet of gross floor area to 2.5 spaces per 1,000 square feet to be consistent with *SP A4.8d*?
8. Should the basis for determining parking requirements be a building's net square feet instead of the current gross square feet?



Questions for Planning Commission Consideration

9. Do you want to consider permitting removal of on-street parking to accommodate outdoor dining or parkletes?



Vision for Mission Street Parklette (DSP, p. 128)



Questions for Planning Commission Consideration

10. Do you want to consider permitting removal of on-site parking to accommodate outdoor dining or open spaces amenities?





Discussion





Upcoming Planning Commission Meetings: General Plan/DTSP Discussions

Date/Time	Location	Topic
July 14, 2020 6:30PM to 8:30PM	On-Line Meeting	Landscape and Signage Building Height Standards Summary of Public Comments for Draft GP and DTSP

