

## Letter 72

C.R. & Barbara Fowler  
Public

August 27, 2009

### **Comment 72-1**

Commenter believes the removal of parking from the Appendix G Checklist will weaken the State's policy to protecting the environment.

### **Response 72-1**

See Response 9-19. Case law recognizes that parking impacts are not necessarily environmental impacts. (*San Franciscans Upholding the Downtown Plan v. City and County of San Francisco* (2002) 102 Cal. App. 4th 656, 697.) Therefore, the question related to parking is not relevant in the initial study checklist. However, if there is substantial evidence indicating a potential for adverse environmental impacts from a project related to parking capacity, such as for example attendant air quality issues that result from cars idling while searching for parking spots, the lead agency must address such potential impacts regardless of whether the checklist contains parking questions. (*Protect the Historic Amador Waterways v. Amador Water Agency* (2004) 116 Cal.App.4th 1099, 1109.) Consequently, the Natural Resources Agency rejects this comment. See Thematic Responses for additional information regarding the deletion of the parking question from Appendix G.

### **Comment 72-2**

Parking standards are the only safeguard against over development. Removing parking from the Appendix G Checklist will signal to lead agencies that inadequate parking should not be addressed.

### **Response 72-2**

See Response 72-1. For identical reasons, the Natural Resources Agency, therefore, rejects this comment.

### **Comment 72-3**

Having parking in the Checklist is the only to force project applicants to consider adjacent resident's views and keep citizens informed of the issues.

**Response 72-3**

See Response 72-1. For identical reasons, the Natural Resources Agency, therefore, rejects this comment.

**Comment 72-4**

Revise the Appendix G Checklist to strengthen parking to help citizens enforce environmentally responsible development while protecting residential areas and property values.

**Response 72-4**

See Response 72-1. For identical reasons, the Natural Resources Agency, therefore, rejects this comment.