Parking Standards for New Development Projects Study Phase 2 – Commercial Uses

TASK FORCE MEETING #2

April 18, 2017
Charles Houston Rec Center
AGENDA

• Welcome and Meeting Recap
• Study Principles and Supporting Plans
• Parking Requirement Approaches
• Parking Policies and Strategies
• Public Comment
Role of the Task Force

Mission: Provide input to City staff on recommended revisions to the City’s parking standards for new development

Tasks:
A. Provide input on proposed revisions
B. Develop consensus (to degree possible) on recommendations
C. Submit report to Directors of P&Z and T&ES on recommendations.
D. Support community engagement efforts by reporting back to commissions, boards, and groups represented
# Role of the Task Force

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Meeting Topic (updated April 12, )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meeting #1</td>
<td>March 21, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Parking Study Background (existing parking policies, standards, and conditions, DSUP/SUP Parking Reductions);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Overview of Commercial Sites Survey and TF’s role;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Other Jurisdictions and Best Management Practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting #2</td>
<td>April 18, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Discuss different requirement approaches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Discuss overarching policies/strategies to potentially include in recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting #3</td>
<td>May 16, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Data Collection findings and discussion of key factors impacting parking demand and trends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Start discussing options and potential recommendations for specific uses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting #4</td>
<td>June 20, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Continue discussing options and potential recommendations for specific uses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting #5</td>
<td>September 19, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Discuss draft recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting #6</td>
<td>October 17, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Finalize recommendations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MEETING Recap

• Why we are doing this study and role of the Task Force

• Reviewed existing parking standards in Alexandria and other jurisdictions

• Overview of the parking surveys

• Background materials
  • Literature on relationship between parking and increased driving/traffic
  • Arlington and Washington DC standards
  • Parking District Map
MEETING GOALS

• Identify City priorities and how parking can support them

• Identify a preferred parking requirement approach for each use

• Identify 2-3 policies/strategies to develop further in association with parking requirements for specific uses
STUDY PRINCIPLES AND SUPPORTING PLANS

• Recognize that providing too much parking:
  • Leads to more driving and congestion
  • Undercuts transit ridership / more expensive to provide
  • More expensive development / less affordable
  • Potentially wasted space
  • People driving to transit-oriented development
  • Degrades urban design and placemaking
  • Heat islands/stormwater problems

• Consider potential spillover impacts and how to mitigate

• Realize the opportunity for a more sustainable and modern parking policy
Approved City plans and policies that support the principles of this study:

- Strategic Plan
- Transportation Master Plan
- Environmental Action Plan
- Vision Zero
- Small Area Plans
Parking Requirement Approach Considerations

Flexible
- Is the approach sensitive to market trends and irregular situations?

Simple
- Does the approach set clear expectations for the development community?
- Is the approach easy to communicate to the general public?

Consistent with City Policies
- Does the approach encourage non-SOV trips?
- Does the approach support the City’s sustainable vision?
Parking Requirement Approach

Minimums Only

- Ratio establishes # of spaces that applicant **must supply**

- Used when a jurisdiction believes applicant won’t provide “enough” parking
- Ratios often based on little or no data
- Frequent assumptions:
  - Parking will be free
  - High auto modeshare
- Complicated re-use of existing buildings
- Reduces affordability
- Does not take trends into account
Parking Requirement Approach

Minimums with Credits

• Ratio establishes # of spaces that applicant **must supply**

• Credit provides **option** to reduce supply based on contextual factors such as:
  • access to transit
  • walkability
  • proximity to public garages
Parking Requirement Approach

Maximums Only

• Ratio establishes # of spaces that applicant must not exceed

• Used to promote specific priorities, such as:
  • Reducing SOV trips and congestion, especially in TOD
  • Promoting walkability, biking, transit
  • Affordability
  • Economic development, including small businesses
Parking Requirement Approach

Maximums with Allowances

• Ratio establishes # of spaces that applicant **must not exceed**

• Allowance provides **option** to supply more parking based on contextual factors such as:
  * **subpar** access to transit
  * **subpar** walkability

• Often used when applicant believes parking maximum ratio will prevent specific tenants
Parking Requirement Approach

Minimums & Maximums

- Establishes **two ratios**

- Ratios create a **supply range** with a high and low end

- Assumes most applicants will supply an amount in the middle of the range
PARKING REQUIREMENT APPROACH

No Requirements

- **Market approach** assumes that applicants will supply parking based on present-day demand

- No Requirements does not mean No Parking
  - Applicant often under pressures to provide parking from lease markets and financial institutions
  - Leads to better management
Parking Requirement Approach

No Requirements based on Gross Floor Area

- Applicants under a specifically defined GFA will have no parking requirement
- Improves development and tenancy potential for smaller sites
- Eases burden on small businesses
- Reduces staff time for complicated workarounds
Task Force Discussion
PARKING STANDARDS FOR NEW DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS

POLICIES/STRATEGIES

• Shared Parking

• TDM program

• Mitigation

• Contextual Requirement or Credit

• In Lieu Fees

• Unbundled Parking
Policies/Strategies – Shared Parking

- On-Site – different uses on the same site share parking
  - Saul Center
  - Gateway at King and Beauregard

- Off-Site – parking on nearby sites can fulfill parking requirement for other uses during off-peak times (or if oversupply is demonstrated)
  - DCHS lot in Del Ray

- Examples:
  - Frederick City, MD
  - Washington, DC
PARKING STANDARDS FOR NEW DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS

POLICIES/STRATEGIES – TDM PROGRAM

• Allow reduced parking in exchange for additional contributions to a Transportation Demand Management Program that focuses on getting people to use transit or other non-SOV modes.
  • Contributions could be used for site specific or citywide programs

• Examples:
  • Arlington, VA
Policies/Strategies – Mitigation

• Require mitigation from developments that under or over park a use.
  • Additional bike racks, bikeshare, trees, carshare, EV spaces

• Examples:
  • Washington, DC
**Policies/Strategies – Contextual**

- Different requirements based on location and access to:
  - Transit
  - Neighborhood Amenities
  - Public parking facilities

- Different requirement based on localized goals, such as:
  - Affordability
  - Reduced traffic/safety
  - Air pollution/health

- Could be a requirement or credit/allowance to go higher or lower

- Examples:
  - Alexandria – Multi-family
  - Norfolk, VA
  - Washington, DC
  - Frederick, MD
  - Portland, OR
Policies/Strategies – In Lieu Fees

• A per space fee is paid in lieu of providing the minimum parking for a site.

• Funds parking projects or other designated projects

• Examples:
  • Tysons Corner, VA
  • Raleigh, NC
PARKING STANDARDS FOR NEW DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS

POLICIES/STRATEGIES – UNBUNDLED PARKING/PRICING

• The cost of a parking space is separated/unbundled from the lease or sale of the building unit

• Parking spaces are priced to encourage other modes

• Examples:
  • Alexandria, VA - Residential
Task Force Discussion
PUBLIC COMMENT
Next Steps

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Meeting Topic (updated April 12, )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Meeting #1</strong>  March 21, 2017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Parking Study Background (existing parking policies, standards, and conditions, DSUP/SUP Parking Reductions);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Overview of Commercial Sites Survey and TF’s role;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Other Jurisdictions and Best Management Practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Meeting #2</strong>  April 18, 2017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Discuss different requirement approaches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Discuss overarching policies/strategies to potentially include in recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Meeting #3</strong>  May 16, 2017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Data Collection findings and discussion of key factors impacting parking demand and trends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Start discussing options and potential recommendations for specific uses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Meeting #4</strong>  June 20, 2017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Continue discussing options and potential recommendations for specific uses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Meeting #5</strong>  September 19, 2017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Discuss draft recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Meeting #6</strong>  October 17, 2017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Finalize recommendations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Thank you!

NEXT MEETING: Tuesday, May 16th
City Hall - Council Work Room

For more information visit alexandriava.gov/ParkingStudies
OR contact Katye North
Katye.North@alexandriava.com
(703)746-4139