

**CALIFORNIA COASTAL COMMISSION**

CENTRAL COAST DISTRICT OFFICE  
725 FRONT STREET, SUITE 300  
SANTA CRUZ, CA 95060  
PHONE: (831) 427-4863  
FAX: (831) 427-4877

**Th 10a****PUBLIC NOTICE****Prepared April 25, 2006 (for May 11, 2006 Hearing)****To:** Commissioners and Interested Persons**From:** Charles Lester, District Director  
Steve Monowitz, District Manager  
Rick Hyman, District Chief Planner**Subject: City of Pismo Beach LCP Minor Amendment Number 1-06 (Parking)**  
Proposed minor amendment to the City of Pismo Beach certified Local Coastal Program to be heard at the Coastal Commission's May 11, 2006 meeting at the Westin South Coast Plaza in Costa Mesa, CA.

The City of Pismo Beach is requesting that its certified Local Coastal Program (LCP) Implementation Plan (IP/Zoning Ordinance) be amended. This amendment request was filed on March 13, 2006 pursuant to Coastal Act Section 30514(b) and California Code of Regulations (CCR) Sections 13554 and 13555. The proposed amendment would:

Revise parking standards by changing required parking spaces (1) for restaurants and conference centers within hotels from one space per five seats to one space per 150 sq. ft. of dining room area and (2) for free-standing restaurants from one space per 100 sq. ft. of gross indoor and outdoor area to one space per 75 sq. ft. of dining and waiting area; also allows tandem residential parking spaces in certain circumstances. (revised IP sections 17.108.020 and 17.108.030)

Based on its review of submitted materials, the Executive Director has determined that the LCP amendment qualifies as a minor amendment. Section 13554(a) of the California Code of Regulation's defines minor amendments to certified Implementation Plans (zoning ordinance) as:

changes in wording which make the use as designated in the zoning ordinances, zoning district maps or other implementing actions more specific and which do not change the kind, location, intensity, or density of use and which are found by the Executive Director of the Commission to be consistent with the land use plan as certified by the Commission.

The proposed amendment does not affect the kind, location, intensity, or density of any use; it simply makes some minor changes in the parking space requirements for two specific uses: restaurants and homes. For restaurants and conference centers within hotels the number of parking spaces required would change from one space per five seats to one space per 150 sq. ft.

**California Coastal Commission**

May 11, 2006 Meeting in Costa Mesa

G:\Central Coast\STAFF REPORTS\2. CCC Meeting Packet\2006\05\Th10a-5-2006.doc

of dining room area. The relevant certified land use plan standard is a minimum of one space per 100 square feet of restaurant dining area (Policy C-14). However, the City (Lautner to CCC, February 14, 2006) explains,

The City has always required fewer parking spaces for restaurants that are associated with hotels and motels than for stand-alone restaurants because of the joint use involved. Many of the persons using the hotel also eat in the restaurant. It makes sense to lower the parking requirement for such combined uses. The use of restaurant associated with a hotel differs from a stand-alone restaurant, therefore. There is no conflict [with the cited policy].

The Commission concurs with this rationale that some of the parking requirement for the restaurant is satisfied by the separate hotel parking requirement and, hence, the intent of the LUP policy is met.

For stand alone restaurants the number of parking spaces required would change from one space per 100 sq. ft. of gross indoor and outdoor area to one space per 75 sq. ft. of dining and waiting area. Assuming non-dining, non-waiting floor area (e.g., kitchen, restroom space) is more than 25% of a restaurant's total floor area, the amendment could lessen the restaurant's overall parking space requirement. The main concern that the Commission would have with any such reduction would involve new restaurants that are permitted near the shoreline that might not have enough parking, forcing their customers to use public spaces that would otherwise be used by beach goers. Such a result could be considered inconsistent with Policy C-14 that requires development within one-quarter mile of the beach or bluff edge to not adversely impact the availability of existing public parking for shoreline access. Policy C-14 further states that additional parking spaces may be required to ensure adequate public parking exists for access to the shoreline. In response, the City (again, February 14, 2006) explains,

There is a little history in the development of these changes. There were two prime motivators: 1) the City has in place a rather draconian parking requirement for restaurants over 4,000 s.f. in area, that was based on a bad experience with one restaurant many years ago. The requirement was not consistent with parking requirements in any other city we surveyed. The requirement made it impossible for some of our local restaurants to expand. 2) Some of our downtown restaurants have been around for a very long time and have no parking on-site at all. Of course these are "grandfathered", but we require parking to be supplied for any additions. When some of these restaurants needed to expand trash and storage areas to comply with health department regulations, they were unable to do so because of the parking requirement, and paying the parking in-lieu fee was prohibitive for no expansion in dining area.

In developing these changes we surveyed a large number of other cities and found that



the other cities either required parking based on gross floor area, as we did, or on dining area alone. The requirement of one space per 75 s.f. of dining area is consistent with the requirements of many other cities, as you will see by reviewing the surveys included in your packet. The requirement of one space per 75 s.f. of dining area is also consistent with the LCP requirement of one space per 100 s.f. of dining area.

c. Shoreline access parking. The City provides parking near the pier for beach access, as well as on-street parking throughout the downtown and the Shell Beach area. Shoreline access parking is also readily available as part of many small blufftop parks and has been specifically allocated by some restaurants (i.e. The Cliffs) as a condition of their development. When it is appropriate, the Planning Commission can increase the parking requirement for a restaurant to assure that its patrons do not monopolize public shoreline parking.

Parking for restaurants on-site is controlled by restaurant owners. Unless specifically required to provide shoreline access parking, restaurants will not allow it during their busy times. Parking for shoreline access is required as a part of new development in areas where such parking is currently inadequate or where city policies require it.

Parking in the city of Pismo Beach for any purpose is not a problem for most of the year. It is sometimes an issue in the summer, and even then greater management of the available spaces would alleviate most of that problem. If anything, excess parking deteriorates the value of our downtown by providing parking at the expense of retail or restaurant uses and by increasing the cost of the services and goods offered. Visitors come to the beach but they patronize our shops and restaurants as well, and can be discouraged from trekking around the downtown when their walks are constantly interrupted by parking lots or when they have to pay significantly higher prices to help finance the expensive development of parking lots on these premium pieces of real estate. For a fuller discussion of the increased value of reducing parking requirements, please read *The High Cost of Free Parking*, by Donald Shoup.

The Commission accepts this explanation agreeing that the amended parking standard would not adversely impact beach-goer parking and finds this portion of the amendment consistent with the certified land use plan.

Finally, for single-family homes, the amendment allows tandem parking in driveways in limited circumstances. Again, this is a minor change that does not affect any kinds, locations or intensities of residential use and is consistent with the certified land use plan..

The purpose of this notice is to advise interested parties of the Executive Director's determination (pursuant to CCR Section 13555) that the proposed amendment is minor as



defined in CCR Section 13554 because it clarifies LCP terminology and does not conflict with Chapter 3 of the Coastal Act or any other policy in the City's certified Land Use Plan (CCR Section 13554(d)(3)).

Pursuant to CCR Section 13555, the Executive Director will report this determination to the Coastal Commission at its May 11, 2006 meeting at the Westin South Coast Plaza in Costa Mesa, CA. The Executive Director will also report any objections to the determination that are received within ten working days of posting of this notice. The proposed minor amendment will be deemed approved and will become effective immediately unless one-third of the appointed members of the Commission request that it be processed as a major LCP amendment (CCR Section 13555(a)).

If you have any questions or need additional information regarding the proposed LCP amendment or the Commission procedures, please contact Rick Hyman in the Coastal Commission's Central Coast District Office in Santa Cruz at the address or phone number listed above. If you wish to register an objection to the proposed minor LCP amendment, please do so by May 10, 2006.

**Attachments:**

Exhibit A: Proposed Text of the City of Pismo Beach LCP Amendment for Parking



# 1983 Code:

## Chapter 17.108: Off-Street Parking and Loading Requirements

### 17.108.020 Minimum Off-Street Parking Requirements

6. Hotels, Motels One (1) parking space per sleeping room; plus one (1) management/employee/guest space for every 20 rooms with a minimum of an additional two spaces.

- A) Dining, meeting and convention combined with hotel/motel: One parking space for every five (5) ~~seats of maximum seating capacity as defined in the Uniform Building Code.~~ each 150 sq. ft. of dining room area.

### 1. Dining and Cocktail Lounges

- a. ~~For restaurants 4000 sq. ft. or less:~~  
One (1) space for every 400 75 sq. ft. of gross dining, waiting, and outdoor dining floor-area plus one (1) ~~space for every 100 sq. ft. of outdoor dining and waiting area.~~
- b. ~~For restaurants 4001 sq. ft. or greater:~~  
One (1) ~~space for every 100 sq. ft. of gross floor area and one (1) space for every 100 sq. ft. of outdoor dining area and waiting area shall be required plus one (1) space for every 50 sq. ft. over 40000 sq. ft. of gross floor area.~~
- c. For dining places with a take-out window, two (2) additional parking spaces are required.

### 17.108.030 General Requirements of Parking Areas

#### 1. Residential

- a. Driveway and access to parking spaces for Residential Zones shall not be less than ten (10) feet in width for up to three units, and all spaces shall be located on the same lot as the dwelling that they are to serve. For four (4) or more units, two-way driveway access must be provided and must be at least twenty-four (24) feet in width.
- b. Parking spaces may not be located in yard setback areas for conforming lots.
- c. A residential use may not generate more vehicles than can be accommodated on the site per the requirements of this section.

<sup>1</sup> Restaurants in conjunction with motels and hotels tend to need fewer spaces because there is a joint use on site.

- d. All residential parking spaces shall be the minimum dimensions established by Table 108-A.
- e. All residential driveways shall not exceed a 20 percent slope.
- f. Residential garage entrances fronting on the lot line in all zones shall be located a distance of not less than twenty percent of the depth of the lot, not to exceed 20' (20) feet from said lot line.
- g. Tandem parking spaces are allowed in the following circumstances:
- 1) On single-family residential lots when the Planning Commission or Director finds that:
    - a.) Existing conditions or terrain on the property present unusual circumstances, justifying the approval of tandem parking;
    - b.) The tandem space(s) is (are) appropriately located on the site.
    - c.) The use of tandem spaces will not jeopardize the health, safety, or welfare of persons in the neighborhood.
    - d.) The use of tandem spaces will result in a better project than would otherwise be feasible and
    - e.) Any two spaces in tandem are under the control of one person or group living together.