

Cory Alan David



MTC/ABAG  
San Francisco, CA.  
Cc: South San Francisco City Council

To whom it may concern:

To be perfectly honest, as I have been trying to develop a strategy to address, what I consider unlawful, state and local municipalities' attempts to make material changes to home purchase contracts utilizing SB9 and 10, I am anything but pleased to learn of AB1401.

I read the detailed justifications for allowing a developer to decline to provide automobile parking for residential housing within one half mile of defined public transportation, if he sees fit. Of course, if he feels magnanimous, he can do so at considerable expense. Not likely. This waiver is predicated on the assumption that proximity to adequate transit means that no residents of these developments will own cars as the proximity to transit will supersede this need. You also have stated that the parking needs addressed in existing projects have often been excessive and wasteful. This is not evident in my community as parking is always in short supply. While I would agree that public transit might adequately address transportation needs for work, I would vehemently disagree that public transit is equipped to facilitate the many ways to enjoy Northern California. I believe that many new residents of these "parking free" projects will still need to own and operate a car and need a parking space.

If you will permit me to speak for the cynics among us, I don't believe that this elimination of previously mandated parking requirements is anything other than a transparent attempt to lower building costs for the developer and allow him to squeeze even more high density housing into a defined space. The lower cost, increased square footage and associated profit will find its way to the developer. As the figures of \$30,000-\$75,000 per parking space is considerable, the incentive to increase profit is highly evident. There is absolutely no guarantee that these savings will find their way to the end user.

So the same cynicism is going to assume that the "powers that be" will force this legislation through without consideration of the desires of the existing residents of the affected communities. That being the case, I'd like to call your attention to the fact that current homeowners historically were forced to comply with stringent parking requirements, often at considerable expense. You are not requiring future housing developments to do the same predicated on a number of assumptions. As those of us in opposition to this failure to address parking will be at the mercy of these assumptions, I would like to offer a plan to make absolutely sure that current residents are not saddled with the consequences of any miscalculation. I believe a mandated parking permit program be instituted within five miles of these projects that have neglected to provide parking. Further studies could adjust this distance up or down when it is determined how resourceful these new residents will be when searching for a place to park a car. If you find parking permits off putting, perhaps homeowners should be instructed to contact the police should an unfamiliar vehicle repeatedly find its way into a neighborhood and be parked overnight. A simple check of the registered address, (assuming it is up to date, if it is from outside the area, that is telling in itself) indicating the owner resides at a housing development in proximity that did not provide parking and a patrol officer could call in a tow truck and have the vehicle impounded. Now as this might seem extreme to address a problem that you have openly implied will not exist, you have absolutely nothing to lose by instituting and enforcing these measures. I will assume you would never expect taxpaying members of the existing community to subsidize the developer by allowing him to rely on publicly funded and maintained street parking for his tenants. Remember, he chose not to provide parking as you gave him permission.

Thank you in advance for providing an ear to these concerns and I would hope you would validate my efforts with a response. Cory A. David