

## **Final Summary Report**

### **The Infilling California Seminar Series**

A six-part evening seminar-lecture series, held in April and May of 2011 on the UC Berkeley campus, attracted over 600 attendees. The program was designed to shed light on how to advance infill development in California as a viable alternative to urban sprawl. Leading professionals, from both the public and private sector, were selected to address challenges and emerging opportunities for infill as California's economic and demographic conditions and environmental mandates change.

The sponsor of this seminar series was the Center for a Sustainable California, part of the Institute of Urban and Regional Development at the University of California, Berkeley. Co-sponsors included the California Chapter of the American Planning Association, the San Francisco District Council of the Urban Land Institute, the California Infill Builders Association, the Association of Bay Area Governments, and the Center for Law & the Environment at UC Berkeley's School of Law.

This report summarizes points raised at the seminars, and concludes with suggested topics for future research based on critical opportunities and challenges identified in presentations and discussions. Visual information presented throughout the seminar series is posted on the Center for a Sustainable California website, <http://sustainablecalifornia.berkeley.edu>.

#### **SEMINAR 1**

##### **Policies and Programs for Sustainable Urban Futures**

This session, moderated by Professor Robert Cervero, provided insights into the methods of creating and managing public policies leading to compact development. Presenters included Joe DiStefano with Calthorpe Associates, Bill Anderson, Director of the City of San Diego's Planning and Community Investment Department, and Megan Gibb, Manager of Portland Metro's Transit-Oriented Development Program. These presentations identified the importance of infill, and also the keys to its successful implementation.

A summary of each panelist's presentation is described below.

#### Joe DiStefano

"California is in trouble, you name a problem, we've got it."

Infill development is at least part of the answer, representing a more holistic approach to dealing with growth.

Part of the problem is the current distortion in market preferences, with large lot housing oversupplied and every other housing option undersupplied.

A large part of projected preferences in housing stock favors Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) housing options.

Additionally, the traditional nuclear family is shrinking as a proportion of households.

Increasingly we are a nation of singles and couples without children.

Where housing is located matters.

Traditional urban centers result in lower vehicle miles travelled (VMT), and various other social impacts (lower energy use, carbon emissions, costs, better health and lower obesity rates).

Neighborhood Typologies: Urban, Compact, Sprawl

- Urban neighborhoods consistently have lower carbon emissions, land consumption, household VMT, and higher walk scores and property values than compact neighborhoods, which in turn score better than sprawling neighborhoods.
- Urban and compact neighborhoods also use less electricity, less water, and spend less on auto and transit expenditures freeing up more money to spend on housing.

Vision California – Calthorpe Associates has developed new analytical tools that are scalable, allowing for the sketching of development at multiple scales and then laying out the environmental, transportation, fiscal and social impacts of these scenarios. Two scenarios have been developed:

- “Business as Usual” assumes a largely standard approach to land use, with some allocation to compact development and minimal urban development
- “Growing Smart” redistributes this to approximately half compact development, a third urban development and minimal standard development.

The Growing Smart scenario would lead to a shift in housing with attached, multifamily and small lot development, although 30% of development would still be large lots. This scenario would also result in greater open space preservation, lower infrastructure and maintenance costs, reduced VMT, increased revenues, reduced energy and water usage, positive health impacts, lower climate change impacts and about \$7,000 in annual cost savings per household.

However, even given all of these benefits and assumed increases in technology, we will likely still fall short of meeting the Assembly Bill 32 objective of an 80% reduction of Greenhouse Gas Reduction emissions against the 1990 levels.

### Bill Anderson

San Diego, in its planning for growth, has called for a shift from multifamily to single-family housing.

This type of planning isn't new to San Diego.

It began with growth management in the 1970s setting up three tiers of management: urbanized, urbanizing and future urbanizing

These management zones were subject to different facility funding strategies to encourage infill development.

However, this strategy came under criticism because urbanized areas were unprepared to deal with the increased densities and infill was of inferior quality.

In the 1990s San Diego began to clean up these policies by implementing developer impact fees, TOD policies, and taking environmental sensitivity into account.

Concurrent to the 1990s process, San Diego created a Multi-Habitat Planning Area that outlined areas to be conserved and set targets for biodiversity and habitat protection. As a result, San Diego is a more bio-diverse city-region with open space defining and linking communities.

In 2008 San Diego completed an update to its General Plan. This was preceded by a strategic framework plan that outlined what the urban form of future development would be: a urban form based largely around infill development. The General Plan Update emphasized the need for an integrated regional transportation network and mixed-use, while balancing communities, economic viability and environmental concerns.

In the process of updating the General Plan, the State of California Attorney General pressured the city to take into account climate change impacts of future development, prompting the city to create a set of tools to address mobility and pedestrian improvements to reduce climate change impacts.

Additionally, the city created an action plan to implement the General Plan priorities and inform budget constraints. Key actions included community update plans and climate change initiatives. The plan is also subject to annual monitoring to assure that progress is taking place.

At the present time San Diego has discovered some challenges to infill development despite a general consensus on increased urbanism. These challenges include:

- Difficulty in financing facilities
- Determining scale and vertical integration with communities
- Problems in complying with traffic modeling and California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requirements
- A lack of diverse examples of infill and design standards.
- A recognition that TOD is not enough to create sustainable infill development.

### Megan Gibb

Portland Metro is a directly elected regional government. It integrates land use and transportation planning, unlike the frequently differentiated organizations in California. Metro was established in 1995 and created the 2040 Framework which calls for the Portland region to focus on “growing up, not out.”

Much like the rest of the country, Portland saw urban divestment in the 1970s. However, the city bucked the national trend of sprawl by redirecting transportation funding from highway projects to rail. Additionally, the city pursued a strategy of public-private partnerships.

The Pearl District is recognized as the quintessential public-private partnership in Portland, where the city paid for certain improvements while the developer provided additional funding for needed infrastructure.

Metro’s TOD program has four primary goals:

- Creating market comparables to help developers get financing for infill projects
- Developing connections with developers willing to pursue TOD projects
- Increasing acceptance of urbanism
- Working to create livable places.

Challenges to the TOD program have included balancing the desire to “move” the market to more urban projects versus “shoving” the market through regulation

The effects of the economic recession and the difficulty in establishing financial backing for projects

The difficulty in balancing a regulatory versus a proactive approach.

Lessons learned by the TOD program include:

- The importance of transit investments leveraging land use (e.g. not next to a highway)
- Enhancing the existing system is equally, if not more, important than expanding the system
- Focusing more on corridor wide planning rather than site-specific planning
- The need to support transit investments with other investments

The Portland Metro program has undertaken a strategic planning process to determine areas that are right for transit expansion by establishing “TOD scores” and typologies for suitability

## SEMINAR 2

### Best Practices in Infill Development

This seminar, moderated by Associate Professor Louise Mozingo, explored best practices in infill development by examining exemplary infill projects from throughout Northern California. Presenters included four private infill developers—Meea Kang of Domus Development, Seth Bland of Wilson Meany Sullivan, Patrick Kennedy of Panoramic Interests, and Denise Pinkston of TMG Partners—each of whom presented one or more infill case studies and discussed lessons learned through the approval process. A number of themes emerged from the discussion, including the challenges of adapting projects to shifting market demands, uncertainty in the entitlement process, and burdensome land use regulations (particularly parking and ground-floor retail requirements).

A summary of each panelist's presentation is described below.

#### Meea Kang

The significant barriers to infill include:

- Restrictive land use policies
- Agencies with inconsistent regulations
- Community resistance
- Political leadership
- Financing—brownfields are more expensive to build on than greenfields

Ways to break down barriers include:

- Forming partnerships with local governments to overcome community resistance
- Leveraging every available financial resource
- Focusing on redeveloping the worst sites in town, such as an old sleazy motel

Local policies must provide incentives and simplify the entitlement process

It's difficult to attract private investment unless there is some assurance that the project will be approved

Building near transit is critical for success, and reduce parking requirements is important

#### Seth Bland

Described multiple projects throughout the Bay Area

Mixed use is a bad idea when it's imposed, citing the example of mandating ground floor retail spaces, which frequently end up being vacant

#### Patrick Kennedy

Cited a case study, the Gaia Building in Berkeley

Development is both economic and political

Keys to success include:

- Identifying your opponents and assembly your allies
- The need to carefully plan parking and open space
- Being creative with parking—car lifts, dedicated car sharing space

More open space isn't necessarily better, and it's important to plan ground floor carefully and with flexibility

Keeping space flexible to allow for different types of tenants is also important

## Denise Pinkston

Cited a case study, the Emeryville Marketplace

Privately-funded shuttles (Emery-Go-Round) can be a good solution for communities like this that are out of reach of major transit systems like BART

Important to keep land use plans flexible to allow for changes in the market

Residential at ground level with individual entrances is better than vacant retail spaces

Infill challenges are the same after 25 years:

- market risk
- high costs
- long lead times
- inadequate infrastructure

Some things have changed, including the evolution of ideas and behavior, and the acceptance of density, transit, paid parking, and congestion

## **SEMINAR 3**

### **Urbanizing Strategies in the Suburbs**

A select group of cities in California have developed policies that have helped create successful, economically vibrant, diverse, attractive, and walkable mixed-use districts and neighborhoods. This seminar, moderated by Associate Professor Karen Chapple, provided first-hand information about successful efforts in the cities of Livermore and Santa Monica from public officials of both communities, as well as from professional consultants who played key roles in implementing downtown suburban transformations. Presenters included Eileen Fogarty, Community Development Director, City of Santa Monica, Jeffrey Tumlin, Principal and Sustainability Practice Leader, Nelson/Nygaard, Daniel Iacofano, Principal, MIG, Marc Roberts, Community Development Director, City of Livermore, Tim Cornwell, Principal, Concord Group, and Gregory Tung, Principal, Freedman, Tung and Sasaki.

Highlights of this seminar are summarized below.

#### Livermore

Livermore wanted to “revitalize and refocus on the center of the community.”

The community was greatly concerned about sprawl, leading to the preservation of open space in the 1990s, and the establishment of growth boundaries to the north and south in the early 2000s.

There were no pedestrians in Livermore’s downtown in 2002. Some historical buildings but lots of ugly buildings as well. There was a lot of opportunity for redevelopment downtown.

The public sector needed to lead and promote catalyst projects to attract developers while also building community consensus on the infill project.

Workshops were held to engage the public, determining that there was a “weak visual character” to the downtown and speeding traffic was a major concern. Workshop recommendations included adding housing downtown, creating public space, shade, and emphasizing the arts without dramatically changing the scale, or ruining the historic character of downtown.

Demand existed, but needed to capture and activate the downtown. The city wanted to avoid the mistake of over-reaching and trying to do too much at once. The city also needed to embrace the

reality that for redevelopment to occur they needed a minimum of 4 stories of mixed-use to overcome costs and parking requirements.

In order to address community concerns and the economic reality of redevelopment, the city shaped development to embrace the historic character of downtown and assure that developments complemented the urban fabric. This was done through visualizations of the future of the project.

The city then looked at what it controlled downtown and what it could do, including the realignment of Route 84 to allow street to encourage desired pedestrian environment, establishing flexible street parking (allowing parking to be flexed in and out to allow café style dining and other uses for parking areas), and embracing a winery patio streetscape to complement the wine character of the surrounding area.

The city also emphasized that there was a need for more than a great plan, they needed implementation. To do so the city:

- Established comprehensive environmental review and expedited processing for downtown development proposals.
- Allowed flexibility to vary from the details of the Specific Plan.
- Lowered development impact fees downtown and provided a variety of incentives.
- Developed in-lieu programs to deal with parking and open space requirements.
- Developed uniform parking standards for all commercial uses allowing easy conversion from one use to another and also incentivized shared parking.

## Santa Monica

Santa Monica is a very urban area, the second densest city in the LA area with a lot of jobs and automobile traffic. Santa Monica also has a history of community infighting and the city desired to take that history and convert it to “community ownership of a balanced General Plan.”

Key issue was how to manage traffic when very little of it is from Santa Monica.

The city needed to find an issue to bring the community around, and hired a legal consultant to help them structure the downtown environmental impact report around a regional perspective.

Another important aspect of the plan was the Expo Line light rail extension into Santa Monica, with three stations all within ½ mile of major job centers. This line is expected to be completed in 2015, and is now the key to linking transit with land use in Santa Monica.

The city also wanted to redirect pressure away from existing neighborhoods and reduce the amount of land available for development, focusing on a transit-oriented development model for accommodating future growth.

In order to get community support, the city embraced a community benefits policy requiring developers to provide community benefits if heights exceed 32 feet (or 36 feet with affordable housing). This was combined with the preparation of specific plans around the Expo Line Stations and a requirement for development agreements on large lots to allow for meaningful placemaking, cohesion, and reduced auto dependency.

As a result of existing traffic congestion, many residents wanted to stop future growth. In response the city adopted transportation strategies emphasizing alternative modes. In order to garner community support, the city looked for a way to adopt a "no net new trips policy", focusing on PM peak trips.

Another solution was to manage parking more effectively: getting prices right, encouraging parking sharing, and adding strategically where needed.

To give policies teeth, the city enacted a host of transportation demand measures through the environmental impact report process, which included the establishment of transportation impact fees, discretionary review requirements, and performance measurements:

- The plan forces 100% of job growth to be next to transit and new development must reduce trips, while existing uses are encouraged to reduce them.
- The city cut ½ of projected auto trip growth by locating development near transit.

The city needed to address anti-growth concerns through good planning and good process, and neighborhood conservation was critical to emphasize that most of the city wouldn't change, and this was achieved through the adoption of a neighborhood preservation overlay zone.

The city also emphasized the legal requirements of following the plan's guidelines to show the community they had recourse should the city stray from the plan. This led to building an active constituency to advocate for the plan and generate ownership of the plan within the community.

## **SEMINAR 4**

### **Creative Financial Tools and Techniques for Infill**

One attraction of infill sites is the availability of existing infrastructure. However, some built-up areas lack sufficient road capacity or transit service. Often infrastructure may be undersized or deteriorated, requiring replacement. In such cases regional and local financial strategies that have been successfully used to support the installation of transit infrastructure, street and pedestrian improvements, utilities, and open-space facilities essential for accommodating successful infill development.

This seminar, moderated by Assistant Professor Dan Chatman, included commentary by Doug Johnson, Senior Transportation Planner with the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC); Jim Kennedy, Redevelopment Director for Contra Costa County; Libby Seifel, President of Seifel Consulting; and Tim Kelly, President of Keyser Marston.

A summary of each panelist's presentation is described below.

#### Jim Kennedy

Summarized his work over the past 25 years to develop the Pleasant Hill BART station area. The immediate station area now accommodates 7,000 jobs, 6,000 residents, and 6,000 daily BART patrons. Ninety-two percent of the redevelopment area is complete with only a few small parcels remaining. He stressed the three most important roles that his agency played in the project: land assemblage, financing of infrastructure, and developing public-private partnerships. The most difficult political challenge of the project was located on unincorporated land, yet it abuts three cities that each had competing visions for what the redevelopment area should accomplish.

#### Tim Kelly

Highlighted his role as a bridge between public sector agencies and private sector developers, and discussed the interest public agencies have in encouraging ground floor retail. He pointed out that most retailers cannot afford the rent of these spaces, and cautioned against mandating ground floor retail.

#### Libby Seifel

Summarized her work in the creation of the Broward Center in Downtown Berkeley, California. This site was formally a surface parking lot one block away from BART's Downtown Berkeley BART station. The final project includes 50% affordable housing with a vertical mix of uses (restaurant space, office space, retail space). One of the most challenging elements of the project was construction of an underground parking garage in close proximity to an underground creek, contributing to a large portion of the overall construction costs. The development had a very high overall cost per square foot, but as a result of a wide variety of public and private funding sources, the project was able to be implemented.

#### Doug Johnson

Provided an overview of MTC's approaches to infill projects. He reviewed three projects that have been well received in a number of communities including Petaluma pedestrian improvements, Downtown Livermore, and the Fruitvale BART transit village. He stressed that the MTC does not want to become too involved in project details, but rather to create an environment which opens up development opportunities through the contribution of planning and capital improvement funds to TOD projects. He also described MTC's Transportation for Livable Communities program that helps fund water/sewer infrastructure and land banking costs.

## **SEMINAR 5**

### **Retrofitting Suburbia**

This session, moderated by Professor Robert Cervero, showcased Ellen Dunham-Jones, Professor of Architecture at Georgia Tech, and co-author of *Retrofitting Suburbia* (John Wiley, 2009). Professor Michael Southworth participated as a discussant

#### Ellen Dunham-Jones

She supplemented previous seminar discussions on infill by focusing on three strategies to "refill", redevelop, and "green" dying or dead enclosed-malls. She outlined 5 imperatives that necessitate more infill across the US: 1) Climate change, 2) Dependence on foreign oil, 3) Public health, 4) Poverty, and, 5) Affordability

Her first strategy, Refill, centered on ways of capitalizing on underperforming surface parking lots through new, denser development. She cautioned that existing buildings should be maintained to ensure a mix of rent prices for different types of businesses and residents. She highlighted three examples of innovative refill projects: Market Hall in Hercules, CA; Oak Cliff, Texas' temporary art installation; and La Grande Orange in Phoenix, AZ.

Her second strategy, Greening, included highlighting a number of projects where existing malls have been greened to accommodate different functions. One mall, Thorton Place in Seattle, added a greenhouse and a food court that partially utilized the produce from the greenhouse, and is an example of reviving a natural habitat that should have never been developed in the first place. Another example was a dead mall in the center of Columbus, Ohio that was demolished for the creation of an urban park.

Her third strategy, Redevelopment, focused on major projects on mall sites that had been demolished. Examples included Belmar in Lakewood, CO; Mashpee Commons in Cape Cod, MA; Tysons Corner, VA; and Fort Totten Metrorail in DC.

She concluded her talk with a call for better design and architecture, stressing that infill is not just about development, but involves creating places that have thoughtful design and quality construction.

### Michael Southworth

While suburban retrofit is an exciting idea to **urban designers** and planners, there are many challenges to achieving it. Would it work in regions that have developed largely according to the low density auto-oriented model? Are there limits? For example, could a city like Phoenix be retrofit in a meaningful way? Do suburbs want to be retrofit? Some of the challenges to suburban retrofit include:

**Connectivity:** Suburbs emphasize auto connectivity, not pedestrian, bicycle or transit. How can cul-de-sacs in existing PUD islands be connected given private ownership of land?

**Density and Diversity:** Even if the cul-de-sacs could be connected, there isn't much to get to because of single use zoning and huge distances between different uses.

**Walkability, Bikability:** Walkability and bikability are difficult to achieve not only because of lack of connectivity, but also lack of sidewalks in many developments. Also, the spatial environment is very boring—who would want to walk there? Pockets of walkability are not sufficient.

**Regulation and Privatization:** Very rigid auto-oriented development regulations for streets, street patterns, zoning, and density have created the problem. They need to be corrected, a difficult—but not impossible—task.

## **SEMINAR 6**

### **Hidden Density: The Potential of Small-Scale Infill Development**

This final seminar explored how secondary units in existing single-family residential neighborhoods can help promote infill throughout California. A diverse group of presenters, moderated by Associate Professor Karen Chapple, consisted of Paul Fassinger, Research Director with the Association of Bay Area Governments, Karen Chapple of UC Berkeley, Carol Berg of the City of Santa Cruz, and Jeremy Madsen of the Greenbelt Alliance discussed the immense potential of Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs). The panelists' presentations were followed by brief responses from Jeremy Liu of EBALDC, Mayor Ann Cheng of El Cerrito, and Mayor Tom Bates of Berkeley. The discussion revealed a number of reasons ADUs are a good housing solution for California generally and the Bay Area in particular. A few reasons include the high number of "empty nesters" in the Bay Area, the potential economic benefits of ADUs, and the public's desire for more compact, walkable neighborhoods. The panel discussion also revealed a number of barriers to implementing ADUs, including burdensome zoning regulations, financing challenges, and an intimidating and confusing entitlement process.

A summary of each panelist's presentation is described below.

#### Paul Fassinger

The Bay Area does need more housing despite the perception that there is a surplus of housing

Main indication: Cost of housing

In the long-term, the balance between multi- and single-family housing will need to change

A significant potential demand for ADUs relates to empty nesters  
Based on preliminary analysis, there seems to be significant potential for increasing density in single-family residential areas

### Karen Chapple

Currently, only 12-15% of homes of East Bay cities have second units

Barriers to increases in ADUs include local restrictions lot size, setbacks, parking.

In addition setback requirements prevent garage conversions, and parking requirements are frequently too high

In a survey to Berkeley residents, 28% of respondents indicated they would like to build a second unit

Key question remaining: What is the market for second units?

Economic/fiscal impacts of second unit construction (assuming 30% of allowable units are built)

In Berkeley, could result in \$382 million in spending, \$2.7 million in property taxes per year

El Cerrito, could result in \$122 million in spending, \$0.9 million in property taxes per year

### Carol Berg

Described the City of Santa Cruz experience, which is widely recognized as a successful model.

Public need (housing crisis) + political will + funding (homeowner tools: manuals, prototypes, financial assistance) = fertile ground

The range of critical issues include:

- Eliminating obstacles
- Parking
- Reduce costs
- Addressing community concerns
- Preserve character of the neighborhood
- Protect adjacent neighbors
- Low interest loans
- Fee waivers

Importance of homeowner tools, including a "how-to" manual, was described.

ADU growth: The number of permits went from 10 per year in 2001 to 50 per year in 2006

More to do

- Incentives to permit illegal units and bring up to code
- Ownership possibilities of ADUs
- Allow for deferred property tax increase or create tax breaks for building ADUs

### Jeremy Madsen

Political and public opinions seem to be shifting in favor of infill and ADUs

There is still a profound fear about reduced quality of life in single-family neighborhoods

Various polls conducted nationally, statewide, and in the Bay Area, affirm that there is growing support for infill

Smart Growth America survey: 63% of respondents would prefer to live in a smaller home closer to jobs and transit

Realtors poll: 58% would prefer to live in a "walkable" community, only 10% of America's building stock is actually in walkable communities

PPIC poll: 77% of CA residents would favor changing local regulations to discourage driving

Marin County poll: Over 50% of respondents favored building more affordable housing

ADUs can help address the desire for more compact development in existing neighborhoods without losing valuable open space

Respondents

Jeremy Liu

An emphasis on ADUs may be a more efficient model for providing affordable housing and increasing densities in existing communities

Unlike high-density, transit-oriented development projects, ADUs are cost-efficient and can be strategically inserted into existing neighborhoods without requiring major infrastructure upgrades

Ann Cheng

There have been major political changes in El Cerrito in the last 10 years

There is a strong desire for walkability, sustainability, and reducing automobile dependence

Tom Bates

The growth strategy in Berkeley has been to protect neighborhoods, and to locate density around transit stations

Berkeley grew about 10% in last decade—made possible by infill

ADUs are an important piece of the puzzle—allowing for better utilization of the existing residential neighborhoods

Key questions remain:

- How do we overcome financing barriers?
- What is the connection between parking and car-share?

Described a pilot project in South Berkeley—free car share membership if you get rid of your car

There is a need to reduce setbacks and lot size requirements

## **Topics for Future Research**

During seminar presentations and discussions, a variety of infill opportunities and challenges were highlighted. It is now possible to identify research areas which, if effectively explored and shared with key stakeholders, could play a significant role in facilitating future successful infill policies, programs and developments in California. These possible areas of research are identified below.

### 1. Ways that the State of California, and regional agencies, could facilitate infill planning and development.

Propose ways that Caltrans, the state's department of transportation, could encourage infill by utilizing performance standards as a basis for determining how to spend state-programmed funds, such as state bond funds, and in allocating competitive grants and loans to localities. This research could also center on ways that the state and regional agencies could direct a greater portion of transportation funds to localities that adopt infill development policies and programs and/or enact parking management policies which support infill, transit-oriented development,

and otherwise reduce automobile travel. Finally, it could be beneficial to examine the feasibility and potential effect tax-increment financing would have on facilitating infill development near transit.

## 2. How the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) could be streamlined to better facilitate infill development.

Assess the strengths, weaknesses, and alternatives to current CEQA requirements applicable to infill development, and examining strategies leading to the encouragement of higher density infill development near transit. This research could also explore the effectiveness that provisions included in the recently passed Senate Bill 375 will likely have in removing procedural barriers posed by CEQA, and also suggest and examine the political feasibility of approaches aimed at "front-loading" CEQA in order to eliminate redundant environmental reviews. Finally, research could examine how other states apply environmental reviews on infill development proposals that could be instructive in the current California context.

## 3. Best practices for simplifying and expediting the local entitlement process for infill development

Local permitting and review processes play an important role in ensuring new infill development meets safety, environmental, and other standards. However, the approval processes are often lengthy and complex, leading to delays and increased expenses that make it difficult to deliver economically viable infill. Expedited permitting and review policies lift these barriers by streamlining the overall development approvals process. Expediting permitting can be used as an incentive to encourage sustainable development patterns that include affordable housing within compact, mixed-use or transit-oriented development.

## 4. Examples of successful alternative parking management strategies

Identify and assess innovative parking management programs from both within California and across the nation, from which California's policy makers and developers can learn in order to promote infill development. Several cities and regions have adjusted their parking requirements to support compact development. Portland, Oregon, for example, has instituted maximums instead of minimums in the central city, as well as shared parking and car sharing, and Arlington County, Virginia has imposed maximum parking requirements based on distance from Metro stations, where the lowest ratio goes to properties closest to the stations.

## 5. Ways of significantly increasing Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs) in California

Examine likely trends in the market for ADUs, including demographic changes, as well as effective innovative local strategies, and ways of overcoming financing barriers. This research could also focus on examining the notion and feasibility of deferred property tax or tax breaks for ADUs, their ownership potential, and how cities could incentivize or mandate car-free tenants through affidavits, deed restrictions or car-sharing incentives.

Prepared by Gary Binger, Matthew Braughton, Matthew Brill, and Seven Lee  
May 25, 2011