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Getting Parking Right for Transit Oriented Development

Why is parking so important?

Parking supply and management is the difference between TOD and sprawl:

- Parking consumes land
- Parking is expensive

We need to manage and supply parking in line with broader goals.

Stuart Cohen, Transportation and Land Use Coalition
Grand America Hotel
- 778 rooms
- 1,200 parking spaces
Even downtown minimum parking requirements...

...often require more parking than building...

...and this is especially true for uses that help create vibrancy and life downtown (restaurants, night clubs, etc)...
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DT = Downtown Specific Requirement

Where do parking requirements come from?
Minimum Parking Requirements- Purpose

- Palo Alto: "to alleviate traffic congestion"?
- Ventura: "to lessen traffic congestion and contribute to public safety and the general welfare"?
- In reality, minimum parking requirements prevent spill-over parking problems.
How is Parking Regulated?

- Most local jurisdictions levy minimum parking requirements
- Key aim: avoid spillover
- Usually based on standards in neighboring jurisdictions, or derived from ITE *Parking Generation*
Minimum Parking Requirements - Source

**Example: Office Parks**

Peak Occupancy Rates, in spaces per 1000 sf of building area:

- Lowest: 0.94 spaces
- Average: 2.52 spaces
- Highest: 4.25 spaces

**Typical requirement:**

4.0 spaces/1000 sf

*Source: ITE’s Parking Generation (2nd ed., 1987)*
### TABLE 3-4
PATAPHYSICAL PARKING REQUIREMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land use</th>
<th>Parking requirement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adult entertainment</td>
<td>1 space per patron, plus 1 space per employee on the largest working shift</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barber shop</td>
<td>2 spaces per barber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beauty shop</td>
<td>3 spaces per beautician</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle repair</td>
<td>3 spaces per 1,000 square feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowling alley</td>
<td>1 space for each employee and employer, plus 5 spaces for each lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gas station</td>
<td>1.5 spaces per fuel nozzle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health home</td>
<td>1 space per 3 beds and bassinettes, plus 1 space per 3 employees, plus 1 space per staff doctor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heating supply</td>
<td>3.33 spaces for every 1,000 square feet of sales and office area, plus 2 spaces per 3 employees on the maximum shift, plus 1 space for every vehicle used in operation of the premises</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heliport</td>
<td>1 space per 5 employees, plus 5 spaces per touchdown pad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machinery sales</td>
<td>1 space per 500 square feet of enclosed sales/rental floor area, plus 1 space per 2,500 square feet of open sales/rental display area, plus 2 spaces per service bay, plus 1 space per employee, but never less than 5 spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mausoleum</td>
<td>10 spaces per maximum number of interments in a one-hour period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nunnery</td>
<td>1 space per 10 nuns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rectory</td>
<td>3 spaces per 4 clergymen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming pool</td>
<td>1 space per 2,500 gallons of water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxi stand</td>
<td>1 space for each employee on the largest shift, plus 1 space per taxi, plus sufficient spaces to accommodate the largest number of visitors that may be expected at any one time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis court</td>
<td>1 space per player</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Planning Advisory Service (1964, 1971, and 1991); Witheford and Kanaan (1971)

- Gas Station – one space per fuel nozzle
- Nunnery – one space per ten nuns
- Mausoleum – 10 spaces per maximum number of interments in a one-hour period
- Swimming pool – 1 space per 2,500 gallons of water
How much is enough?

- No right answer
- No such thing as set “demand” for parking:
  - Pricing
  - Availability
  - Choices
- Supply is a value judgment based on wider community goals
- Don’t confuse supply and availability
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Parking Regulation Barriers to TOD

Two Scenarios

1. Developers forced to provide more parking than unconstrained demand

2. No incentives/requirements for developers to manage parking to support Smart Growth goals
3 Broad Approaches for Local Jurisdictions

- Tailor minimum parking requirements to match demand
- Incentivize or require parking strategies to reduce vehicle trips and promote smart growth
- Abolish parking requirements – let the market decide

Choice depends on local context and planning goals
Option 1

Tailor parking requirements to match unique & highly localized demand
Tailor Parking Requirements

Parking demand varies with geographic factors:

- Density
- Transit Access
- Income
- Household size

Cities can tailor parking requirements to meet demand, based on these factors.

15-35 Units/Acre = Big Reduction

Source: John Holtzclaw data
Tailored Requirements

Examples:

- Mountain View and San Jose, CA – parking reductions for transit oriented development
- Seattle – reduced parking requirements in mixed-use areas
- Portland and Arlington – reduced parking requirements close to transit
Tailored Requirements

- **Advantage** – avoids spillover problems
- **Disadvantages** – complex to introduce effectively, does not constrain parking demand
- Sees parking requirements as a technical exercise, not a policy decision
Option 2

Incentivize or require parking strategies to reduce vehicle trips & promote smart growth
Constrain Supply

- Overall principle: encourage less auto-oriented development
- Promotes self-selection – residents with fewer cars live close to transit
- Different approaches:
  - Parking maximums
  - Requirements/incentives for demand management
- Needs to be complemented with Residential Permit Parking or other strategies to combat overspill
Many Potential Strategies

- “Park Once” District
- Parking Benefit District
- Transportation Improvement District
- Universal Transit Passes
- Parking Cash-Out
- Pricing Strategies
- In-lieu Fees
- Carpool & Vanpool Incentives
- Transportation Resource Center
- Bike/Ped Facilities
- “Unbundle” Parking Costs
- Residential Transit Passes
- Residential Parking Permits
- Carsharing Program
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**Summary**

**Public Parking**

- **1,581 Total OFF-Street Public Parking Spaces**
- **+ 2,534 Total ON-Street Public Parking Spaces**

**Private Parking**

- **+ 1,906 Total Private Off-Street Parking Spaces**

**= 4,115 Total Public Parking Spaces**

**= 6,021 Total Parking Spaces Downtown**

*Source of base maps: April 2003 Katz, Okitsu and Associates Parking Study*
Parking Maximums

- Promotes alternatives to the private automobile
- Can tackle congestion if related to roadway capacity or mode shift goals
- Maximizes land area for other uses
- Appropriate in areas with strong real estate market where priority is to minimize auto dependence
- Examples: downtown San Francisco, Portland, Cambridge
Option 3.

Abolish minimum parking requirements
Abolish parking requirements

- Let developers, the public and the market decide
- Create a level playing field
- Needs complementary Residential Permit Parking strategy to combat overspill
Stuart, FL: A Downtown Revived

- Parking requirements eliminated

- After four years:
  - Number of downtown businesses up 348%
  - Town able to lower its tax rate
Successful Precedents

Reviving neighborhoods by abolishing minimum parking requirements:

• Coral Gables, FL
• Eugene, OR
• Fort Myers, FL
• Fort Pierce, FL
• Great Britain (entire nation)
• Los Angeles, CA

• Milwaukee, WI
• Olympia, WA
• Portland, OR
• San Francisco, CA
• Seattle, WA
• Spokane, WA
• Dar es Salaam, Tanzania (?)
Case Study: Market and Octavia, San Francisco

Community goals:

- Maximize housing production
- Ensure housing affordability
- Limit gentrification
- Promote pedestrian quality
- Limit traffic
Proposed Parking Policies

- Eliminate all minimum parking requirements
- Parking maximums:
  - Residential – 0.25-0.75 spaces/unit
  - Non-residential – 1 space per 2,500-4,500 sf
- Unbundle parking
- Enforce cash-out laws
- Require parking to be setback from the street
- Limit curb cuts
Combating Spillover

- Parking is barrier to new housing
- Solution: Revise Residential Permit Parking program
- Limit permits to curb capacity
- Market price for new permits
- Direct revenue to transportation/neighborhood improvements
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Residential Parking Benefit Districts

- In various configurations, residential parking benefit districts exist in:
  - Boulder, CO
  - Aspen, CO
  - Santa Cruz, CA
  - Tucson, AZ
  - West Hollywood, CA
  - Isla Vista, CA (in progress)
  - San Francisco, CA (under study)
Petaluma, CA – Key Issues

- Want new life downtown, economic success
- Perceived parking shortage
- Vacant buildings – couldn’t meet parking requirements
- Fear of spill-over parking
- Fear of traffic
- Worsening housing crisis
- Budget crunch
Petaluma Principles

- Create a “Park Once” Environment
- Make parking respect the pedestrian
- Manage on-street parking
- Provide shared garages
- Eliminate on-site parking requirements
- Expand transportation choices
- Form-based SmartCode
Phase Out Parking Minimums

- Interim Requirement:
  - 3.3 spaces / 1000 s.f.
  - 1 space per dwelling unit
  - ‘In-lieu of parking fee’ option

- Phase II – Phase Out Parking Requirements

- Prerequisites:
  - Effective on-street management
  - Neighborhoods protected from spill-over parking
  - Approval of new public parking
Development Impacts

- Nov ‘02: Project start
- June ‘03: Code adopted
- June ‘03: $75 million project (theater, retail, apartments, office) submitted
- Saved 100+ parking spaces
- July ‘03: project approved, under construction
## High & Low Traffic Strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Typical Tools</th>
<th>'Tailored' Minimum Requirements</th>
<th>Abolish Minimum Requirements</th>
<th>Set Maximum Requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Typical Requirements** | • Requirement > Average Demand  
• Hide all parking costs                          | Adjust for:  
• Density  
• Transit  
• Mixed Use  
• ‘Park Once’ District  
• On-street spaces  
• ...etc.                                | • Market decides  
• Garages funded by parking revenues  
• Manage on-street parking  
• Residential pkg permits allowed by vote | • Limit parking to road capacity  
• Manage on-street parking  
• Market rate fees encouraged/required |
| **Traffic**            | High                                                                          | Low                               |                               |                           |
| **Housing Costs**      | High                                                                          | Low                               |                               |                           |
| **Pollution**          | High                                                                          | Low                               |                               |                           |
Making the Transition

- Manage spillover
- Give curb space a value
- Popular alternatives – cash out, car-sharing
- Relate parking policies to community goals
- Stakeholder and community outreach
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See also: “Parking, Myth and Reality”, www.linemag.org