



SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Planning Commission Resolution No. 18106

HEARING DATE: JUNE 10, 2010

Project Name: Car-Share Policy
Case Number: 2009.0187
Staff Contact: Kevin Guy, Sharon Lai and Joshua Switzky
kevin.guy@sfgov.org, sharon.lai@sfgov.org
Reviewed by: AnMarie Rodgers, Manager Legislative Affairs
anmarie.rodgers@sfgov.org, 415-558-6395

Recommendation: **Approve Resolution Establishing Commission Policy Regarding Car-Share and Intent to Initiate Amendments to the Planning Code**

1650 Mission St.
Suite 400
San Francisco,
CA 94103-2479

Reception:
415.558.6378

Fax:
415.558.6409

Planning
Information:
415.558.6377

INITIATING COMMISSION-SPONSORED AMENDMENTS TO PLANNING CODE SECTION 166; ESTABLISHING COMMISSION POLICY TO CREATE GUIDELINES REGARDING THE DISPLACEMENT OF CAR-SHARE SPACES BY NEW DEVELOPMENT; ESTABLISH PROCEDURES FOR COMMISSION DELIBERATION OF CAR-SHARE REQUIREMENTS BEYOND THOSE IDENTIFIED IN SECTION 166; STATING THE COMMISSION'S DESIRE TO EXPLORE A CITYWIDE SYSTEM FOR ON-STREET CAR-SHARE PARKING NETWORK; AND MAKING FINDINGS OF CONSISTENCY WITH THE GENERAL PLAN AND PRIORITY POLICIES OF PLANNING CODE SECTION 101.1.

PREAMBLE

Whereas, at multiple public hearings during the fiscal year 2008/2009, the Planning Commission requested that staff explore the current controls and issues relating to car-share;

Whereas, our basic choices for urban transportation modes haven't changed much since the early 20th Century: public transit, walking, biking, and the single-owner automobile. The newest option, car-share, isn't a technological innovation but is a new way to use cars;

Whereas, San Francisco is a leader in the car-share movement. Car-sharing began in the United States just over 10 years ago. City CarShare began in 2001 and the Planning Commission instituted car-share requirements shortly thereafter, with the 2005 adoption of the Rincon Hill Plan;

Whereas, the City is still learning about how to best implement car-share and about how car-share relates to other policy goals;

Whereas, the Commission seeks to refine implementation of car-share controls in San Francisco.

Whereas, on April 8, 2010, the San Francisco Planning Commission (hereinafter "Commission") conducted a duly noticed public hearing at a regularly scheduled meeting to consider the proposed Ordinance; and

Whereas, on June 10, 2010, the Commission conducted a duly noticed public hearing at a regularly scheduled meeting to consider the proposed Ordinance; and

Whereas, the Commission has heard and considered the testimony presented to it at the public hearing and has further considered written materials and oral testimony presented on behalf of the applicant, Department staff, and other interested parties; and

Whereas, the all pertinent documents may be found in the files of the Department, as the custodian of records, at 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco; and

MOVED, that the Commission hereby *adopts* this Resolution to establish Commission policy regarding car-share and that pursuant to Planning Code Section 302(b), the Commission adopts a resolution of intent to initiate amendments to the Planning Code.

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, That pursuant to Planning Code Section 306.3, the Planning Commission authorizes the Department to provide appropriate notice for a public hearing to consider the above referenced Planning Code amendments contained in the draft Ordinance, approved as to form by the City Attorney in **Exhibit C**, to be considered at a publicly noticed hearing on or after July 1, 2010 with the modifications specified below:

1. Amend Section 163 of the Planning Code to include the promotion and encouragement of car-share services as a component of transportation management programs and transportation brokerage services in C-3, Eastern Neighborhoods Mixed Use and South of Market Mixed Use Districts as described in Section 163 of the Planning Code and
2. Amend the residential and commercial parking requirement to enable the Commission to require that property owners seeking to exceed the permitted levels of parking provide car-share memberships to future residents and tenants.

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Commission directs staff to prepare a memorandum detailing:

1. how car-share requirements are monitored, with special attention to tracking the requirements through future subdivision of properties with car-share requirements;
2. whether large projects and projects under the jurisdiction of the Redevelopment Agency, such as Treasure Island, Bayview Hunters Point Shipyard/Candlestick, and Transbay, are subject to the Planning Code requirements of car-share; and
3. the maintenance costs of car-share spaces over the long-term and potential impacts on affordable housing as well as interactions between the residential parking requirements and car-share requirements for affordable housing.

FINDINGS

Having reviewed the materials identified in the preamble above, and having heard all testimony and arguments, this Commission finds, concludes, and determines as follows:

1. Recent Commission actions requiring the replacement of market-rate, fee-based car-share spaces may have generated unintended consequences of discouraging voluntarily providing car-share parking. Property owners have described an increasing hesitance to voluntarily provide car-share parking on underutilized lots due to a perception that such use may be indefinitely required in the future. The majority of car-share parking spaces in San Francisco are currently provided voluntarily, outside of requirements of Planning Code Section 166 and Planning Commission Conditions of Approval. **The Commission hereby recognizes that voluntary car-share parking spaces are a valuable component to the success of San Francisco’s overall car-sharing program.**

2. While the City should encourage car-share spaces within development, the provision of these spaces should not compromise the delivery of much-needed housing, especially affordable housing. The Commission recognizes that there are different types of car-share parking and there are different relative benefits of these types. Required car-share spaces are valuable to the City and the surrounding neighborhood because they are provided free of charge to certified car-share organizations, and have been proven to reduce the number of individually-owned vehicles, vehicle miles travelled, and vehicle emissions. These spaces have been demonstrated to reduce: (i) the number of individually-owned automobiles per household; (ii) vehicle miles traveled per household; and (iii) vehicle emissions generated per household. Existing spaces that are provided on a fee-basis to car-share services may be more easily replaced at a new location. **The Commission now establishes that residential and mixed-use development proposals that would result in the loss of existing car-share spaces shall be reviewed in the context of our general preference outlined in the chart below:**

Project Description	Proposed Replacement Policy
Removal of Existing Required Car-Share Parking Where the Associated Project is Not Demolished.	1:1 Replacement Required
Loss of Existing Required Car-Share Parking Where the Initial Project is proposed for Demolition and Replacement.	No Replacement Required Benefits and impacts of new project should be evaluated as a whole. Project is subject to the car-share requirements of the Planning Code.
Loss of Existing Fee-Based Car-Share Parking without new proposed project.	No Replacement Required

3. **The Commission recognizes the appropriateness of the existing requirements and affirms that the Commission will seek to increase these requirements only in extraordinary cases where transportation impacts of the specified project combined with the project location warrant additional mitigations.** There may be times when the Planning Commission will determine that a proposed project has extraordinary circumstances, such as exceeding the targeted levels of parking as identified in the Planning Code, and that the provision of this additional parking may result in increased traffic within the neighborhood. In such instances, the Commission declares its intention to require one or more car-share spaces beyond those required by Planning Code Section 166, upon finding that 1) the proposed project exceeds the amount of parking permitted by the Planning Code; or 2) the project or additional parking encourages additional private-automobile use, creating localized transportation impact for the neighborhood; and 3) this transportation burden may be lessened for the neighborhood by the provision of additional car-share spaces. Car-share spaces required beyond the scope of Section 166 shall only be required when extraordinary circumstances are found.

4. Where the Commission finds extraordinary circumstances as described in number three above, the Planning Commission may require additional car-share at the amounts reflected in this table:

<i>Residential Units</i>		
Number of Residential Units	Number of Required Car-share spaces	Guidelines for Commission-Imposed Additional Car-share Spaces When Certain Findings are Made
0-49	None	1
50-200	1	2
201 or more	2, plus 1 for every 200 units over 200	3, plus 2 for every 200 units over 200
<i>Non-Residential Uses</i>		
Number of Parking Spaces (Non-Residential Uses or in a Non-Accessory Parking Facility)	Number of Required Car-share spaces	Guidelines for Commission-Imposed Additional Car-share Spaces When Certain Findings are Made
0-24	None	1
25-49	1	2
50 or more	1, plus 1 for every 50 spaces over 50	2, plus 1 for every 40 spaces over 50

5. It is acknowledged that the arbitrary allocation of required car-share parking beyond that stated here may result in an imbalance of development and undue financial burden to the sponsor.
6. The State Vehicle code was amended in 2006¹ to give local jurisdictions the ability to designate certain streets or portions of streets for car-share vehicle parking or rideshare² parking. Since this amendment to the Vehicle Code, San Francisco has yet to implement a widespread system of on-street space for car-share. In order for car-sharing to be most effective as an alternative transportation choice, it should be integrated with larger land use pattern and transportation system instead of established on an ad-hoc basis through project approvals. Pod locations should be coordinated with population density and transportation infrastructure. Currently the pod growth is largely directed by car-share providers who operate within their own institutional goals and not necessarily with City or regional goals in mind. While this may be an effective growth strategy within the business model of a car-share organization, **it behooves the City to establish a larger framework that works in coordination with the City's proposed residential growth and plans for transportation infrastructure investment.**
7. Early, in the City's car-share history, pods were located in public garages. Since 2005, no new pods have been established in City-owned garages. As some car-share organizations are private, for-profit organizations, dedication of public space for private profit has raised important questions about the use of public goods. Similar issues are sure to arise in conjunction with proposals for the dedication of on-street parking for car-share service providers. That said, **the benefit of providing on-street car-share spaces can significantly improve the quality of the City's car-share program in the following ways:**
 - a. **Proliferation of spaces:** The on-street placement of car-share spaces would foster the adequate distribution and availability of car-share vehicles throughout the City, particularly in dense areas that lack sufficient off-street parking for pods.
 - b. **Legitimacy of car-sharing:** the placement of car-sharing vehicles in key on-street locations provides for added recognition and legitimacy of car-sharing as a City recognized and encouraged program.
 - c. **Perceived safety of car-share:** the location of on-street car-share has proven to increase the perceived safety of utilizing the program, where in a survey "87% of car-share users felt safer accessing on-street cars,"³ simply by being located in an open public area rather than parking garages.
 - d. **Efficiency of on-street parking spaces:** Most privately owned vehicles remain parked for a large portion of the day, whereas the goal of a car-share vehicle is to allow

¹ AB 2154, Goldberg. Parking: car share vehicle. Approved by Governor August 28, 2006. Filed with Secretary of State August 28, 2006.

² Ridesharing is a form of transportation, other than public transport, in which more than one person shares the use of a vehicle, such as a van or car, to make a trip.

³ Arlington County (Virginia) Commuter Services, Arlington Carshare Program Report, June 15, 2006, p. 11.

utilization of the same car by various members with varying usage period needs within any given day. This represents a more efficient use of collective resources because the on-street car-share spaces can act similarly to taxi stands or curbside bus stops and provide a service benefit to many more people than a regular on-street parking space.⁴

8. **Therefore, the Commission hereby requests further exploration of these issues through independent analysis by the City and that the findings be part of an update to the City's General Plan, especially the Transportation Element.**
9. **Finally, the Commission urges the Planning Department to engage the issue in coordination with other transportation agencies of the City and County and the region at large.**
10. **General Plan Compliance.** This Resolution is consistent with the following Objectives and Policies of the General Plan:

I. HOUSING ELEMENT (2004)

OBJECTIVE 1

TO PROVIDE NEW HOUSING, ESPECIALLY PERMANENTLY AFFORDABLE HOUSING, IN APPROPRIATE LOCATIONS WHICH MEETS IDENTIFIED HOUSING NEEDS AND TAKES INTO ACCOUNT THE DEMAND FOR AFFORDABLE HOUSING CREATED BY EMPLOYMENT DEMAND.

POLICY 1.6

Create incentives for the inclusion of housing, particularly permanently affordable housing, in new commercial development projects.

II. TRANSPORTATION ELEMENT

OBJECTIVE 1

MEET THE NEEDS OF ALL RESIDENTS AND VISITORS FOR SAFE, CONVENIENT AND INEXPENSIVE TRAVEL WITHIN SAN FRANCISCO AND BETWEEN THE CITY AND OTHER PARTS OF THE REGION WHILE MAINTAINING THE HIGH QUALITY LIVING ENVIRONMENT OF THE BAY AREA.

OBJECTIVE 4

MAINTAIN AND ENHANCE SAN FRANCISCO'S POSITION AS THE HUB OF A REGIONAL, CITY-CENTERED TRANSIT SYSTEM.

OBJECTIVE 12

DEVELOP AND IMPLEMENT PROGRAMS IN THE PUBLIC AND PRIVATE SECTORS,

⁴ Ibid., p. 12.

WHICH WILL SUPPORT CONGESTION MANAGEMENT AND AIR QUALITY OBJECTIVES, MAINTAIN MOBILITY AND ENHANCE BUSINESS VITALITY AT MINIMUM COST.

OBJECTIVE 34

RELATE THE AMOUNT OF PARKING IN RESIDENTIAL AREAS AND NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL DISTRICTS TO THE CAPACITY OF THE CITY'S STREET SYSTEM AND LAND USE PATTERNS.

POLICY 34.1

Regulate off-street parking in new housing so as to guarantee needed spaces without requiring excesses and to encourage low auto ownership in neighborhoods that are well served by transit and are convenient to neighborhood shopping.

POLICY 34.3

Permit minimal or reduced off-street parking supply for new buildings in residential and commercial areas adjacent to transit centers and along transit preferential streets.

11. This Resolution is exempt from CEQA per CEQA Guidelines Section 15060(c)(2).
12. This Resolution is consistent with the eight General Plan priority policies set forth in Section 101.1 in that:
 - A) The existing neighborhood-serving retail uses will be preserved and enhanced and future opportunities for resident employment in and ownership of such businesses will be enhanced.
 - B) The existing housing and neighborhood character will be conserved and protected in order to preserve the cultural and economic diversity of our neighborhoods.
 - C) The City's supply of affordable housing will be preserved and enhanced.
 - D) The commuter traffic will not impede MUNI transit service or overburden our streets or neighborhood parking.
 - E) A diverse economic base will be maintained by protecting our industrial and service sectors from displacement due to commercial office development. And future opportunities for resident employment and ownership in these sectors will be enhanced.
 - F) The City will achieve the greatest possible preparedness to protect against injury and loss of life in an earthquake.
 - G) That landmark and historic buildings will be preserved.

- G) That landmark and historic buildings will be preserved.
- H) Parks and open space and their access to sunlight and vistas will be protected from development.

I hereby certify that the Planning Commission ADOPTED the foregoing Resolution on June 10, 2010.



Linda Avery
Commission Secretary

AYES: Miguel, Olague, Antonini, Lee, Moore, and Sugaya

NAYS: none

ABSENT: Borden

ADOPTED: June 10, 2010