

# **Beverly Hills General Plan Topic Committees**

## **Residential Issues Committee**

### **Report of Final Recommendations**

September 25, 2003

- I. INTRODUCTION
- II. COMMITTEE CHARGE
- III. EDUCATIONAL PROCESS
- IV. COMMUNITY OUTREACH
- V. RECOMMENDATIONS
- VI. APPENDICES

## **I. INTRODUCTION**

Single family residential development in Beverly Hills is characterized by some of the highest land costs in the nation, no control other than the basic zoning “envelope” over the design of single family houses, a large amount of allowable lot coverage, and the increasing desire of property owners to build as much house as the zoning will allow. Over the last 20 years, much construction in single family areas has taken place with seemingly little knowledge of authentic architectural styles or regard for the impact on streets characterized by older, smaller houses. As a Committee, we have endeavored to craft recommendations that acknowledge that households today want larger homes than when the City was developed in the 1920s and 1930s, but support a return to the aesthetic and concern for community appearance evident in the types of houses built in that period.

Similarly in the multifamily residential areas, home to over 60 percent of the community’s households, our recommendations are focused on preserving the character and scale of older development, and limiting the scale of new development in most areas zoned for multifamily residential. Given that there is almost no net additional remaining development potential in areas zoned for single family residential, our discussions about affordable housing have focused on multifamily areas.

The Recommendations section of the report is organized to correspond to the charge given to the Committee by the City Council.

## **II. THE CHARGE TO RESIDENTIAL ISSUES TOPIC COMMITTEE**

The charge given to the Residential Issues Committee in the City Council’s appointing resolution asked that in considering the housing needs of all segments of the community, we address, at a minimum:

- Affordability (for existing residents and workers in the City), the impact of housing costs on the future demographic profile of the City; the requirements of State law.
- General development standards for single family dwelling units (size, setbacks, parking, walls, etc.)
- General development standards for multifamily dwelling units (number of lots, size, setbacks, parking, etc.)
- Design review of single family and multifamily structures
- Overnight parking
- Construction practices

### **III. EDUCATIONAL PROCESS**

The Residential Issues Committee participated in the three, all-Committee briefing session that began the General Plan Topic Committee project and has met 17 times as a Committee. We have reviewed a comprehensive summary of development standards and reviewed the considerable body of material that exists regarding Planning Commission and City Council efforts over the last 12 years to address regulation of single family and multifamily residential development. We have had a number of guest speakers on specific topics and have individually made numerous excursions to survey neighborhoods and to share our observations. Our Committee's briefing book with additional information on the material we studied can be found in the Appendices.

### **IV. COMMUNITY OUTREACH**

The Committee participated in three efforts to obtain a sense of the community with respect to its charge. The Committee hosted an open house in the City Hall South Wing/Municipal Gallery on a Saturday afternoon in February, 2003, sending invitations to over 600 community organizations and individuals, including those who had applied to be on the Committees. Exhibits related to each of the charges were mounted and we were on hand to talk with attendees.

In April, 2003, the Committee participated in the all-Committee session at which we presented our preliminary recommendations and thinking on the issues to the members of the other Committees and received their verbal and written comments.

In June, 2003, the Committee distributed a brief opinion survey to every household in the City with an excellent response rate received.

A summary and the complete record of community input can be found in the Appendices.

### **V. RECOMMENDATIONS**

#### **A. Housing Affordability for Existing Residents and Workers in Beverly Hills.**

Providing more affordable housing for residents and essential workers is one of the greatest challenges facing any community. Under State law, housing affordability must be addressed in the General Plan. The Housing Element is required to identify specific goals that meet as much of the community's need for affordable housing as can be met, given the constraints and opportunities of the community's circumstances. A State agency reviews Housing Elements every five years for compliance with

State law, and a finding of non-compliance as a result of legal action can potentially have disastrous consequences for a community. The Committee has reviewed the State-mandated requirement that the City's housing program address the existing need of its 3,000 lower income households paying more than 30 percent of income for housing, as well as the relatively small amount of future growth (256 dwelling units) that is anticipated by 2005. We discussed many aspects of housing affordability, including rent control, the limited federal, State or City funds devoted to affordable housing, high land cost, and limited number of vacant sites. After much discussion we recommend that the focus of the City's efforts should be on Beverly Hills seniors and housing for public safety personnel and teachers employed by the Beverly Hills Unified School District.

**V. A. 1. Affordable Senior Units**

In projects above some minimum size, require a set-aside of a few units for lower income seniors, offered to Beverly Hills residents on a priority basis, in market-rate, privately developed senior projects designed for independent or assisted living.

Reduce the parking requirements for affordable senior units, although the guest parking requirements should be retained.

• *Rationale:*

- There is a great need for affordable senior housing; seniors are 20 percent of the population and many have limited, fixed incomes.
- Residential rental rates are increasing, outpacing even office rental rates.
- Seniors don't have the same rate of vehicle ownership as does the general population, although guest parking requirements should be maintained for visiting relatives or caretakers.

• *Implications*

- Some seniors who otherwise would be forced out of the City by rising rental rates may be able to find more affordable housing within the City.
- Developers of market rate senior housing would have to finance and build using a different set of development standards (set-aside units, reduced parking) than those in place currently.

- **Resources Required to Implement:**  
Time of decision-makers and staff to determine appropriate set-aside formula and to modify Zoning Code.

**V. A. 2. Height Increase for Affordable Units:**

Allow an additional story in some multifamily residential areas in exchange for including some affordable units that would be offered to Beverly Hills senior residents or essential workers (public safety employees, particularly “first responders,” and BHUSD teachers) on a priority basis. No more than one additional story is recommended. A specific inclusionary formula is not recommended at this time. This should be determined as the result of an analysis that would craft a program appropriate for the Beverly Hills housing market, but could be, as an example, ten percent of units for projects above some minimum size.

- **Rationale:**
  - In the absence of federal or State subsidies, there is a need to provide both incentives and requirements for private developers to build units affordable to low- and moderate-income households.
  - If more units are permitted to be constructed on a site, the cost per unit will be less and will offset to some degree a requirement that some of the units be set aside as affordable.
  - The opportunities should be expanded for lower income Beverly Hills seniors to remain in the community when rent levels exceed their ability to pay.
  - The community would be safer if public safety personnel lived nearby and were therefore better able to respond to emergencies. It would be easier to attract and retain high quality employees such as teachers.
  - Some multifamily residential areas could have additional height without undue impact because of the five-story multifamily residential heights of the nearby areas or the prevalence of commercial land use. Examples of such areas include between Santa Monica Blvd. and Burton Way east of the C-5 zone, or east of La Cienega and south of Wilshire Blvds.
  - Many other communities around the State and locally successfully employ an inclusionary requirement as a way to promote more affordable housing.

- *Implications*
  - There may be resistance from some members of the community to the idea of additional height, regardless of its location, and to the idea of trying to provide for housing that is more affordable, even if intended for the community's lower income seniors and essential workers.
  - The inventory of affordable housing would be increased.
  - The inclusionary requirement/height increase formula should take into consideration that an increase from four to five stories requires a different, more expensive type of construction under the Building Code and the expense of subterranean parking.
  
- *Resources Required to Implement*

Time of decision-makers and staff, possibly involving funding for the assistance of a consultant, to determine appropriate inclusionary formula, occupancy qualification, locations for additional height, and to modify Zoning Code.

V. A. 3.

***Minimum Unit Size:***

Reduce the 1,000 square foot minimum unit size for one-bedroom apartments and condominiums to something between 600 to 800 square feet. Consider reducing the required parking for units that do not exceed this size to one space, retaining the existing guest parking requirement of ¼ space per unit.

- *Rationale:*
  - More affordable housing is needed.
  - Reduced minimum unit size would somewhat reduce the cost to build.
  - 1,000 sq. ft. is considered too big to be a minimum size for a one-bedroom unit.
  - Reduces the potential for the State, when reviewing the City's General Plan Housing Element, to determine the City's development standards inhibit development of more affordable housing.
  
- *Implications:*
  - Market is for larger units, so impact may not be immediate.
  - Interested developers would be able to include units in their projects costing less than the larger ones that are in demand as 'luxury' housing.

- Parking requirements encourage construction of large units because when the unit/bedroom count requires a second level of parking, many projects are rendered financially unfeasible, resulting in a disincentive to build more units.
- *Resources Required to Implement:*  
Time of decision-makers and staff to modify Zoning Code.

**V. B. Development Standards for Single Family Houses**

In considering the effect of existing development standards, the Committee discussed the regulations governing height, setback, size, placement on lot, etc., reviewed the heights, sizes and setbacks of a variety of specific houses, and examined a number of schematic diagrams. We concluded that the standards were generally acceptable, with the exceptions noted below. In particular, we felt that the maximum allowable size of houses is not as important a factor in creating the impact on the street as how the houses are designed. We concluded that application of zoning standards alone cannot insure the construction of appropriately scaled homes that are consistent in architectural style and compatible with the streets on which they are located.

**1. *Garages:***

There is no requirement to have an enclosed garage currently except in the Hillside Area. A two-car garage should be required for all new single family houses. Require existing garages to be maintained or replaced during major remodeling. Where major remodeling takes place that involves additional square footage on the property, require a garage if one does not exist. Permit one-story garages to be located on side and rear property lines, consistent with the original development patterns in the City.

- *Rationale:*
  - If garages were available and were used to park cars, there would be fewer cars visible from the street.
  - Garages located at the rear of a house, if designed to have street access, provide a larger de facto side yard setback because of the driveway. Also, additional cars can be parked in the driveway along the side of the house, thereby reducing the undesirable look of cars parked in front of houses.
  - While repositioning vehicles parked in tandem may not be as convenient as parking cars on paved areas in front of

houses, the practice has nevertheless been going on for decades.

- Vehicles parked in front of houses are extremely unsightly and diminish the garden quality of the City.
- There is enough room on smaller lots to place a garage.
- *Implications:*
  - Property owners building new houses or undertaking major remodels would be required to build a garage. As older houses with garages are demolished, new houses replacing them will also have garages in which cars can be parked or stored out of sight.
  - Garages involve more building/mass on the site than surface parking spaces.
  - Although an ordinance could be passed mandating garages can only be used to park cars, enforcement would be difficult.
- *Resources Required to Implement*  
Time of decision-makers and staff to modify Zoning Code.

The Committee is considerably divided on the issue, however it is recommended that south of Wilshire Boulevard, some increase in the amount of allowable paving in front yard setbacks be considered.

**V. B. 2.**

***Side Setbacks:***

Side setbacks in the Central R-1 Area (south of Sunset Blvd.) should not be reduced any further from the existing requirements.

- *Rationale:*
  - Houses are close enough already; techniques other than reduction of side setbacks should be used to address the design of houses and appearance of bulk and mass.
  - Larger setbacks maintain a degree of privacy and a pleasing appearance because there is more light, space, air and landscaping between homes.
- *Implications:*  
Offering reduced side yard setbacks as an incentive would no longer be available as a voluntary incentive to achieve other goals, e.g., increased façade modulation, lower height, etc.

- *Resources Required to Implement:*  
None; no change to existing regulations is proposed.

V. B. 3. **Maximum Single Family Unit Size:**

Maximum house sizes should not be reduced from the 1,500 sq.ft. + 40 percent of lot size formula. (Example: 6,000 sq.ft. lot = 3,900 sq.ft. house)

- *Rationale:*  
Property is too expensive to not permit houses of this size and today's households need homes larger than those originally built on the small lots south of Santa Monica Blvd. The implementation of design review will provide the means to minimize the appearance of bulk, which is a function of design more than size.
- *Implications:*  
People will continue to be able to build a house of a size that is somewhat commensurate with the cost of property in Beverly Hills.
- *Resources Required to Implement:*  
None; no change to existing regulations is proposed.

4. **Landscaping Standards and Completion Bond:**

Require a completion bond for the landscaping of single family houses or remodels that involve removing the front landscaping. Develop landscaping standards and include drought-tolerant programs as an option. Limit removal of mature trees that are not unsafe, diseased or causing damage, and develop a requirement for some minimum size tree in proposed landscaping plans. Create an award program for outstanding landscape design and installation.

- *Rationale:*  
Landscaping is required currently, but there are no standards in place regarding plant materials, size, placement, overall design in relation to the house, etc. Landscaping makes a significant contribution to the look and impact of a new house. Often people don't budget for it, resulting in inadequate or no landscaping, despite Code requirements for landscaping plans. Undersized plants and trees are often installed, with the neighbors and community having to live with an unsightly result for extended periods of time.

- *Implications:*  
Completion of landscaping creates goodwill in that neighbors do not have to look at barren or inadequate landscaping for months after construction is completed.
- *Resources Required to Implement*  
Implementation will require initial time of decision-makers and staff to develop criteria, standards and processes. It will require application of the criteria, standards and processes on an ongoing basis. This may involve additional staff, possibly as part of the same staff necessary to implement the recommendation for design review of single family houses.

V. C. **Design Review of Single Family and Multi-Family Structures**

The Committee devoted considerable time to the issue of design review of single family houses. Discussion focused on the significant departure from past practice represented by a design review requirement. We acknowledge and appreciate property owners' right to design and update homes for their families; however, with rights come responsibilities. We feel that the design quality of new homes has deteriorated enough to threaten the established character of the single family residential areas and warrants creating a design review process.

1. ***Design Review of Single Family Houses:***  
Require some form of design review of new or substantially remodeled single family houses. The process should avoid neighbor conflicts and formal public hearings as much as possible. No specific process is recommended, however design review could require compliance with a set of adopted design guidelines, or be waived if the house is under a certain size. Design guidelines should emphasize authentic period revival designs typical of the City's original history and character. Those applications that do not comply with the guidelines, or that are larger, would undergo design review on a discretionary basis. The design review process should recognize the streetscape, mass, bulk and scale of neighborhoods and encourage harmony or consistency in the design of individual houses and within the street or neighborhood. Any appointed design review board should have well-established architectural design credentials.

Create an award program for well-designed single family houses such as the one we have now for commercial and multifamily projects. To publicize and promote adherence to design

principles, develop educational brochures or style guides to assist property owners and architects in understanding what is and what is not acceptable.

- *Rationale:*

- There are numerous examples of unsightly houses that have been built and will continue to be built using different architectural styles on the same house, inappropriate details and scaling that aren't authentic to the style, and sparse landscaping. Such houses are incongruous with the City's original development and scale, and represent an undesirable change in the City's character and reputation for beauty, dignity and elegance. Even small houses can be made to look out of scale if the house is two stories and pushed to the front setback line.
- The Committee acknowledges that stopping this trend by requiring design review is a proposal that engenders both strong support and strong opposition in the community and will require additional resources to implement. The Committee nevertheless feels that the look and character of neighborhoods will continue to be radically altered unless design review is implemented as soon as possible. The homeowner, the block, the neighborhood and ultimately the entire city will benefit by devoting the political and financial resources necessary to safeguard harmonious design and consistent architectural styles.
- Many other communities, such as San Marino and Glendale, have successfully had design review in place for many years.
- Applicants frequently do not hire qualified architects to design their houses, but rather rely upon contractors. Requiring design review could encourage, or require, an applicant to employ a qualified licensed architect to assist in creating the design of a new house.
- Design review has been required for many years for multifamily residential and commercial development.

- *Implications*
  - As new construction occurs, the trend in recent years of badly designed, out of scale houses will be minimized, the level of architectural quality of new construction will be improved and the character of Beverly Hills neighborhoods will be preserved.
  - The personal, financial and governmental dynamics inherent in establishing any discretionary review process will manifest for those applications that are required to be reviewed on a discretionary basis. In other words, implementation may engender controversy; the potential for some neighbor conflicts will be created because noticed, open meetings may be required for some applications; the time and expense for the applicant will increase when a controversial design is proposed; and the possibility of appeals to the City Council on design-related decisions will be created.
  - To the extent that applications are required to conform, or may choose to conform, to a set of design guidelines that are adopted via a public process and administered by qualified staff, the discretionary review process, and application of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) can be avoided. CEQA requires applications found to have a significant adverse impact on an historic resource must have an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) prepared before the decision-making body can take action. This means for those applications reviewed on a discretionary basis, the potential exists for an EIR to be required of an applicant who proposes to demolish or substantially alter a house determined to have historical significance.
  
- *Resources Required to Implement:*
  - Time of decision-makers and staff to develop and adopt design guidelines and a program to review new and significantly remodeled single family houses.
  - Identification and selection of qualified volunteer design professionals to serve on any discretionary design review board.
  - Ongoing staffing of administration of design guidelines.
  - Ongoing staffing of an appointed design review board.

**V. C. 2. *Design Review of Multi-Family Structures:***

Multi-family residential structures should continue to undergo design review. Renewed efforts should be made to break up the appearance of mass and bulk on three- and four-lot developments.

- *Rationale:*  
The benefits of the design review process are evident both in the quality of new buildings, and in the poor design of rejected proposals that meet Code and would otherwise have been constructed.
- *Implications:*  
The costs and benefits of design review of multifamily structures will continue.
- *Resources Required to Implement:*  
None; no change to existing regulations is proposed

**D. Multifamily Residential Development Standards**

The Committee considered the wide variation in the scale of development that exists on the streets zoned for multifamily residential development. The Committee reviewed the December 2002 staff report on R-4 Modulation and January 2003, bus tour information booklet that were prepared for the City Council. The discussion covered the issues of parking, and the impacts of large, new buildings, particularly on streets south of Wilshire Boulevard.

**1. *Older Apartment Structures and Intact Streets:***

Encourage reinvestment and upgrades in older apartments on streets that have largely intact older, original apartment buildings. The economic life of older buildings could be extended by programs similar to the ordinance that was enacted that permits reconstruction of detached garages without observing rear yard setbacks. Additional programs to extend the life of older buildings should be pursued. For example, such encouragement could involve tax breaks or some other economic incentive. In areas designated as historic districts, federal funds and tax credits may be available for rehabilitation of structures. Designated historic structures might be permitted to slightly increase the annual allowable percentage increase in rental rates when significant upgrades are made to the units.

- ***Rationale:***
  - Some of the older building stock and streets are integral to the City's character.
  - Older units are generally more affordable than new condominiums or apartments.
- ***Implications***
  - Incentives for reinvestment in older buildings will encourage the rehabilitation and maintenance of these buildings, thereby preserving the character of original apartment areas.
  - Many older buildings have less than Code-required parking and extending the economic life of the buildings will delay the provision of adequate off-street parking.
- ***Resources Required to Implement***  
Time of decision-makers and staff to develop and implement programs.

**V. D. 2. *Larger Multi-family Residential Structures:***

Currently the multifamily residential density formula permits an increasing density bonus for assembly of two, three and four lot developments. Modify these standards to limit development sites to a maximum of two lots on streets of 30 feet or less and three lots on streets of more than 30 feet in width.

- ***Rationale:***
  - Three- and four-lot buildings have a much greater impact on light, air and visual impact than two-lot buildings, particularly on narrower streets in the southern part of the City. The City's streets were designed and laid out in an era when smaller scale development occurred.
  - A reduction from a four-lot to a two-lot or three-lot maximum site size could result in a reduction in the remaining theoretical development capacity; however, because assembly of four-lot sites is relatively rare, the reduction in the number of units likely to be built is not as great.
  - Mixed residential-commercial development in commercial areas of the City can compensate for the loss of, and possibly expand, the multifamily residential development potential.

- *Implications*
  - The character of streets with older development would be retained.
  - Potential densities and traffic on residential streets would be reduced from those which may occur under the existing standards.
  - Property values might decrease slightly.
- *Resources Required to Implement*  
Time of decision-makers and staff to revise Zoning Code.

**V. D. 3.**

***Senior Housing:***

Encourage assisted living facilities for seniors, with required set-asides for lower income seniors and priority given to Beverly Hills residents for set-aside units. Consider permitting an additional story or other incentives for such developments.

- *Rationale:*
  - Seniors are a significant percentage of Beverly Hills' lower income residents and older, frailer seniors are in particular need of assistance.
  - Providing housing for seniors who are still able to live independently with some assistance provides for a more balanced community. Opportunities for existing residents who are seniors, and who will become seniors, would be expanded.
  - Any additional housing provided for lower income residents helps to meet the needs of existing lower income senior households.
- *Implications:*
  - There may be political resistance to incentives involving greater height.
  - Set-aside programs would require monitoring and administration.
- *Resources Required to Implement:*  
Time of decision-makers and staff to develop and implement Zoning Code revisions and programs.

**V. D. 4. *Minimum Unit Size***

Reduce the minimum unit size of a one-bedroom unit from 1,000 sq. ft., possibly to 800 sq. ft.

- *Rationale:*

- o 1,000 sq. ft. is excessive as the minimum size for a one-bedroom unit.
- o To the extent that additional, smaller units are constructed, housing will be less expensive and therefore more affordable.
- o Reducing the minimum one-bedroom unit size somewhat will further reduce “governmental barriers” to the construction of housing as discussed in State housing element law.

- *Implications:*

Over time, more affordable units could be constructed.

- *Resources Required to Implement:*

Time of decision-makers and staff to amend the Zoning Code.

**5. *Townhouse Development:***

Permit townhouse development on the substandard-sized lots that are currently zoned for single family that are south of Olympic Blvd. (Wetherly, Almont, LaPeer, Swall, and Clark). Possibly include other transition areas where commercial and single family back up to each other, such as Le Doux Rd. Reaffirm existing General Plan policy, including N. Doheny Dr. between Wilshire Blvd. and Burton Way

- *Rationale:*

The variety of housing product available in the community is limited to single family houses, apartments and condominiums. A limited amount of townhouse style development would increase the variety of housing types, and may appeal to younger families.

- *Implications*

- o Expanded variety of housing product available in the community
- o To the extent that townhouses are developed, there would be an increased amount of housing available to accommodate community’s future growth.

- o Potential resistance on the part of affected property owners.
- o Potential support on the part of affected property owners.
- *Resources Required to Implement*  
Time of decision-makers and staff to develop appropriate standards and process Zoning Code amendments.

**V. D. 6. *Mixed Use:***

Although not specifically in our charge, we support the existing program in the General Plan that calls for allowing mixed use housing in commercial areas because it will provide some additional housing, and will expand the variety of housing types available in the community.

**E. Construction Practices**

The Committee discussed the current limitation on construction (weekdays only unless by special permit) and considered whether it was advisable to extend construction hours to a weekend day, under certain circumstances, in order to shorten the overall construction period. We also considered measures that could improve safety, and improve communication between neighbors, construction sites, and City enforcement staff.

**1. *Hours:*** No change is recommended in the existing regulations limiting construction to Monday – Friday, 8:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m.

- *Rationale:*  
Residents are entitled to relief from construction impacts on the weekends.  
Allowing any construction, even limited interior work, on the weekends would be difficult to enforce. The existing prohibition on weekend work is often abused and permitting weekend work would result in greater infractions.
- *Implications*  
None; no change to existing policies.
- *Resources Required to Implement*  
None; no change to existing policies.

**V. E. 2. Safety:**

On congested streets where construction-related truck activity occurs, a flagman should be required when crews are operating and equipment and vehicles are arriving and departing.

- *Rationale:*  
Improved safety.
- *Implications*  
Residents will be able to pass construction sites on narrow streets more safely.
- *Resources Required to Implement*  
Resources of staff for enforcement of flagman requirement.

**3. Notice:**

Neighbors should be informed about the on-site construction-related restrictions.

- *Rationale:*  
It is desirable for construction site neighbors to be informed of what is and what is not allowed in order to recognize violations. They should be made aware of what contractors are permitted to do.
- *Implications*  
Greater understanding and communication between neighbors and contractors.
- *Resources Required to Implement*  
Staff time to develop, implement and oversee notification process; some additional time/expense for property owner/contractor to provide required notification.

**F. Overnight Parking**

In reviewing the policies and regulations that govern overnight parking in the community, the Committee considered the causes of the demand by residents and their guests for overnight street parking in single family and multifamily residential areas. Our Committee's charge was limited to overnight street parking policy but we acknowledge that various conditions contribute to the demand for street parking and are being addressed by other Committees. We also discussed the test program that provides 13 free overnight guest parking passes to each household in the multifamily residential areas.

**V. F. 1. *Single Family Areas:***

The prohibition on overnight street parking in single family areas should remain in place.

- *Rationale:*  
The safety and character of Beverly Hills would be adversely affected by allowing overnight parking on streets in single family residential areas. The Police Department has and continues to support this policy.
- *Implications:*  
None; no change in existing policy is proposed.
- *Resources Required to Implement:*  
None; no change in existing policy is proposed.

**2. *Multi-family Areas:***

Recommend that consideration be given to reducing the number of overnight parking exemptions from the overnight parking prohibition that residents may have each month and/or charging a modest fee.

- *Rationale:*  
Under a test program, in the multifamily areas every unit can get 13 free overnight parking exemptions per month for guests. This is in addition to the exemptions that qualified residents can already receive but must pay for. There are many streets where street parking is not available to residents due to the high demand for spaces. If everyone used the guest exemptions there would be no on-street parking for residents who have to pay for their on-street permits.
- *Implications*
  - o Residents would not be able to have as many as 13 free guest overnight street parking exemptions each month and/or would be required to pay a fee for them.
  - o Residents who do not qualify for on-street exemptions for their additional vehicles, and residents who may be selling the free exemptions would not be able to use as many guest overnight street parking exemptions each month. This frees some street parking for residents who do qualify for the resident exemption for which they pay.
  - o Potential political resistance from residents who are relying upon the overnight guest exemptions to meet their parking needs.

- *Resources Required to Implement*  
Time of decision-makers and staff to analyze program and implement modifications.

**V. F. 3. Off-Street Overnight Parking Supply:**

Area-wide parking solutions should be aggressively pursued by the City, including involving interested owners of private parking in large structures. Consider and explore keeping one of the other municipal parking structures open 24 hours a day (a system currently operating in the Civic Center parking structure), and publicize the availability of both.

- *Rationale:*  
More overnight, off-street parking is needed.
- *Implications:*
  - To the extent that fewer cars are parked overnight on streets, improved safety would result.
  - Additional overnight parking would be made available to residents and their overnight guests.
  - Potentially, on some occasions, resident/guest overnight parking demand could be in competition with the evening users of such parking structures.
- *Resources Required to Implement:*
  - Considerable time of decision-makers and staff to explore, formulate, and implement an area-wide parking program involving private parking facilities.
  - Time of decision-makers and staff to determine feasibility of increased usage of the Civic Center structure that may occur as a result of increased public awareness of its availability, and that of any other structure.
  - Increased staff would be required to keep an additional public parking structure open 24 hours per day and to promote public awareness of the availability of the parking.

*Respectfully submitted,  
The Residential Issues Committee*

<i>Barry Alexander</i>	<i>Marie France</i>	<i>JoAnna McCullough</i>	<i>Gail Silver</i>
<i>Michael Blumenfeld</i>	<i>Hamid Gabbay</i>	<i>Benedicta Oblath</i>	<i>Susan Strauss</i>
<i>Gary Briskman</i>	<i>Marilyn Gallup</i>	<i>Gloria Seiff</i>	<i>Estelle Weisberg</i>
<i>Stefan Dahlerbruch</i>	<i>Judith Linde</i>	<i>Bill Shaw</i>	<i>Marilyn Weiss</i>

**VI. APPENDICES**

- A. Appointing Resolution**
- B. Briefing Book**
- C. Community Outreach**
- D. Meeting Notes of Residential Issues Committee meetings.**