Commercial Parking Standards Update
Planning Commission Worksession
October 3, 2017
Worksession Overview

1. **Receive an update** on the City’s commercial parking standards study.

2. **Discuss the recommendations** of the Task Force.

3. **Provide input** on the draft recommendations.
What is included in this study?

• Review of parking requirements for:
  • Office
  • Hotel
  • Retail
  • Restaurant

• Develop a process for Shared Parking
How were our current parking requirements created?

1930s - Overcrowded curbspace led to:
• Parking Meters
• Off-street parking requirements

Cities started adopting requirements
• Little to no research
• Often copied

1963 – Alexandria’s last comprehensive update
• Car ownership
• No Metro
What are the results from these parking requirements?

A LOT of parking was built

Parking is still identified as a TOP issue for the City

10% of the City is a parking lot (does NOT include on-street parking or garages)
What are the results from these parking requirements?

- Promoted driving and congestion
- Suburban style development that’s further apart
- Residents NEED a car to get around
- Historic buildings demolished and green space paved over to make parking lots
- Development became more expensive
- Stormwater, environmental issues
- Health issues
- Undermined walking, biking, transit
- Supply-side requirements not solving parking
How has the City changed and What will the future bring?

- More ways to get around

- Plans and development:
  - walkability
  - lower parking ratios

- New developments are approved with lower requirements
  - But many still have unused parking

- Future Needs:
  - Autonomous vehicles
  - Ridesharing
  - Changing commercial trends
How does Parking Work Today?

• Existing buildings - Hard to add parking
  • Can prevent filling existing storefronts
    ⇒ King Street CBD Zone
  • Business expansion
  • Off-site parking contracts
  • SUP – Time, money for small businesses

• New Developments – how much parking?
  • 40% of the commercial cases in the last 5 years included a parking reduction
    • ALL were approved

• On-street management policies and programs
Which policies and plans support updating the parking requirements?
How is the City updating its parking requirements?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Appointee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning Commission (1)</td>
<td>Nathan Macek, Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Commission (1)</td>
<td>Melissa McMahon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic and Parking Board (1)</td>
<td>James Lewis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former Old Town Area Parking Study Work Group (1)</td>
<td>John Gosling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAIOP, the Commercial Real Estate Development Association (1)</td>
<td>Michael Workosky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed-Use Developer with experience in Alexandria and other urban areas (2)</td>
<td>Austin Flajser Jeremy Lena</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Alexandria Residents (3)</td>
<td>Christopher Ferrara Danielle Fidler Shari Simmans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Alexandria Residents with Expertise in Regional Transportation or Parking Issues (1)</td>
<td>Cathy Puskar</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Task Force has held monthly meetings that are open to the public since March 2017
What are some assumptions for updated parking requirements?

- People will still drive
  - How many people? How often?

- Travel patterns are changing

- Alexandria is not Manhattan
  - But Alexandria is moving towards more urban development

- Old Town has different parking conditions

- Sensitive to spillover impacts
  - May require different on-street management
What are the goals for updated parking requirements?

- Consistent with City policies and plans
  - Increase non-SOV trips
  - Support investments in transit
- Promote and encourage Small Businesses
- Attract quality development and investment
- Improve quality of life for residents
- Simplified and flexible ratios
- Consistent with market trends
What are the major takeaways from the study data and Task Force discussion?

60 sites surveyed throughout the City
What are the major takeaways from the study data and Task Force discussion?

- Every site except 1 had a lower parking demand than required
- 59% Average peak occupancy
- 32% travel to hotels via taxis, Uber, and Lyft
- 52% of restaurant-oriented trips did not require parking
- Zero parking reductions have been denied in the past 5 years
- Some sites are leasing spaces to utilize excess parking
Task Force’s Draft Recommendations for Consideration

- Simplified map
- Different ratios for areas with good transit access
- Minimum and Maximum Ratios
- Standardize Ratios (spaces by 1,000 sf)
- Combined Retail Ratio
- Exemption for small uses
- Shared Parking
Task Force’s **Draft** Recommendations for Consideration
Task Force’s **DRAFT** Recommendations for Consideration

**Minimum and Maximum Ratios**

- Current Zoning Ordinance only has a minimum requirement

  - *Recommendation - Establish a parking range with a minimum to ensure some parking is provided and a maximum prevents overbuilding of parking*

- Allows for flexibility among different tenants and locations
- Accommodates future changes in parking needs
- Parking Modification process to build outside the range
Task Force’s **DRAFT** Recommendations for Consideration

### Standardize Ratio

- Current Zoning Ordinance has a variety of parking requirements

- **Recommendation** – Create a parking requirement based on spaces per 1,000 sf

- Easier to understand
- Allows for flexibility among different types of tenants in the same space

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Floor Area in Square Feet per Floor</th>
<th>Required Number of Parking Spaces per Given Square Feet of Floor Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not Less Than</td>
<td>Not More Than</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1 per 200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>1 per 210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>1 per 220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 per 230</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Existing Retail Parking Requirements
Task Force’s **Draft** Recommendations for Consideration - **OFFICE**

![Graph showing Observed Parking Ratio (spaces/1,000 sf) for Sites within Enhanced Transit Area and Sites outside Enhanced Transit Area with Average Observed Ratio (1.3) and (1.8).]
Task Force’s **Draft** Recommendations for Consideration - **HOTEL**

*Hotel shares parking with other uses and/or allows daily and monthly parking for the general public*
Task Force’s Draft Recommendations for Consideration - HOTEL

Approved HOTEL Developments (2012-2017)

Spaces per Room
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Hilton Garden Inn (1620 Prince)
Hotel Indigo (220 S. Union)
Hampton Inn (1616 King)
Robinson Terminal North (500 N. Union)
Towne Motel (800 N. Washington)
Old Colony Inn (1101 N. Washington)
King Street Hotel (1619 King Street)
Union Street Adaptive Reuse (115 N. Union)
Combined Retail Ratio

- There are 8 different parking requirement categories for retail and other commercial uses (e.g. commercial schools, amusement enterprise, non-retail, etc.)

- Recommendation – Combine these requirements into a “retail and other commercial” category

- Easier to understand
- Allows for flexibility among different types of tenants in the same space
Task Force’s Draft Recommendations for Consideration - RETAIL

- **Average Observed Ratio (2.3)** for Sites within Enhanced Transit Area
- **Average Observed Ratio (1.8)** for Sites outside Enhanced Transit Area

- **Mixed Use/Shopping Center**
- **Stand Alone Retail**
Task Force’s Draft Recommendations for Consideration - RESTAURANT

- **Shopping Center/Mixed Use Building**
- **Stand Alone Restaurant**

*Average observed parking ratio (2.9) without outlier; Average including the outlier is 3.4*
## Task Force’s Draft Recommendations for Consideration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Hotel</th>
<th>Office</th>
<th>Retail</th>
<th>Restaurant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Min</td>
<td>Max</td>
<td>Min</td>
<td>Max</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Within Enhanced Transit Area</strong></td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Beyond Enhanced Transit Area</strong></td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Same Minimum for Office and Retail to allow change of uses
- Same Maximum for Retail and Restaurants

*Note: Parking modifications through an SUP would still be possible*
Exemption for neighborhood businesses

- Many businesses have to request parking reductions before opening or expanding, which can be costly and delay opening

- **Recommendation** - No parking requirements for uses under a certain size
  - Expansion of the existing exemption on King Street and along Mount Vernon Ave

- Eliminates the parking burden for neighborhood businesses
- Encourages more ground floor retail
-Promotes small infill development and reinvestment in existing buildings
Task Force’s **DRAFT** Recommendations for Consideration

**Shared Parking**

- Current Zoning Ordinance forces each use to provide its own parking, even when not used

  - **Recommendation** – *Create an approval process to allow and encourage shared parking*

- More efficient use of existing parking
- Way to help small businesses meet their parking needs without building expensive parking
What have we heard?

• Impacts to Old Town and Del Ray
• Concerns about extent of exemptions
• How does this apply to existing developments
• Support for shared parking
• Off-street parking vs on-street management
• Are the maximums too high
• Is this a giveaway to developers
• Neighborhood business vs parking requirement
What are the next steps?

**October/November**
- Continue outreach efforts
- Receive feedback
- City Council
- Other stakeholder groups

**November**
Finalize Task Force recommendations

**December**
Public Hearings on proposed amendments
Thank you and Questions

For more information visit alexandriava.gov/ParkingStudies
OR contact Katye North Katye.North@alexandriava.gov (703)746-4139
Task Force’s **Commercial Parking** Recommendations for Consideration - **Office**

### Comparison of Parking Requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing Zoning</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Area Plans</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recent Approvals</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observed</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed - Within</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhanced Transit Area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed - Outside</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhanced Transit Area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Washington, DC**
  - Minimum: 0.5
  - Maximum: 5.0

- **Arlington, VA**
  - Minimum: 1.67
  - Maximum: 2.22

- **Annapolis, MD**
  - Minimum: 1.57
  - Maximum: 2.8

- **Falls Church, VA**
  - Minimum: 1.5
  - Maximum: 3.33

- **Frederick City, MD**
  - Minimum: 0.25
  - Maximum: 2.25

- **Montgomery County, MD**
  - Minimum: 0.5
  - Maximum: 3.03

- **Cambridge, MA**
  - Minimum: 1.5
  - Maximum: 2.5

* DC allows a 50% reduction for transit; Arlington allows lower ratios through additional TMP contributions
Task Force’s **Commercial Parking** Recommendations for Consideration - **Hotel**

**Comparison of Parking Requirements**

- **Existing Zoning**
- **Small Area Plans**
- **Recent Approvals**
- **Observed**
- **Proposed - Within Enhanced Transit Area**
- **Proposed - Outside Enhanced Transit Area**

- **Washington, DC**
- **Arlington County, VA**
- **High Density - Baltimore, MD**
- **Seattle, WA**
- **Annapolis, MD**
- **Montgomery County, MD**
- **Norfolk, VA**
- **Frederick City, MD**

* DC allows a 50% reduction for transit
Task Force’s **Commercial Parking Recommendations for Consideration - Retail**

### Comparison of Parking Requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Washington, DC</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>6.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arlington, VA</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falls Church, VA</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frederick City, MD</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montgomery County, MD - Parking Lot District</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge, MA</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norfolk, VA - Downtown</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>1.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newark, NJ</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Allows for exemptions for small uses and/or proximity to Metro
Task Force’s Commercial Parking Recommendations for Consideration - Restaurant

Comparison of Parking Requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Spaces per 1,000 sf</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposed - Within Enhanced Transit Area</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed - Outside Enhanced Transit Area</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington, DC</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montgomery County, MD - Parking Lot District</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norfolk, VA - Downtown</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukee, WI</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newark, NJ</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego - Transit Area</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Allows for exemptions for small uses