

Lapira, Katrina

From: Pearson, Alene
Sent: Tuesday, October 1, 2019 12:51 PM
To: Lapira, Katrina; Horner, Justin
Subject: FW: Comment on Transportation Demand Management Framework

From: Diego Aguilar-Canabal [mailto:d.aguilarcanabal@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, October 1, 2019 12:50 PM
To: Pearson, Alene <apearson@cityofberkeley.info>
Subject: Comment on Transportation Demand Management Framework

Dear Planning Commissioners,

I urge you to move affirmatively this week toward eliminating minimum parking requirements for new housing in Berkeley. Free space for private automobile storage creates "induced demand" for vehicle traffic, which we must actively reduce to meet our climate goals. 60% of Berkeley's emissions come from transportation-- mandating transportation infrastructure for automobiles is the wrong approach to this problem.

There are understandable concerns that new market-rate housing is too expensive to accommodate the median renter in Berkeley's growing workforce. To that end, please consider this recent [research paper from Canada](#) which found that each parking space per unit adds approximately 12.5% to the cost of new housing, and two spaces can increase costs by 25% or more. [Research from Seattle and Portland](#) found that renters bore an increased cost burden of 9% for required parking, and up to 18% of affordable housing subsidies were eaten up by parking requirements. Notably, these costs accounted for revenues of parking that was actually used-- this is due to parking being *underutilized*. (Blessedly, more data from Portland showed that [parking-free development](#) had little to no impact on parking availability overall.)

Mandating subsidized storage for cars in a region well-served by transit, where car ownership is declining, would be the equivalent of forcing an agrarian permaculture community that grows its own healthy produce to buy Fritos with food stamps.

Some commissioners appear to be looking at these potential cost reductions as a windfall profit for developers. But the inverse of this logic must be considered: forcing developers to build parking passes these costs on to tenants, and the expense of much-needed housing, and creates a windfall for automobiles, which can capture the value of free real estate. I fully support taxing windfall real estate gains equitably by reforming Proposition 13 and ending tax subsidies for heirs of luxury mansions and large commercial developers, but that is outside the purview of this particular commission.

Instead, you as public servants can take a positive step toward making the city more affordable for human beings, rather than giving away our valuable land to automobiles for free. Please do so.

Thank you,

--

Diego Aguilar-Canabal (240) 743-6340