Parking Standards for New Development Projects
Phase 1: Multi-family Residential
Right-Sizing the City’s Parking Regulations

City Council Public Hearing
April 18, 2015
Why Right-Size Parking Standards Now?

- Declining demand
- Efficient use of land
- Maximize space for people over cars
- Parking is expensive
- Reduce impervious surfaces
- Neighboring jurisdictions are rightsizing
- Already addressing through SUPs
- Revising parking standards will not impact public benefits
Changing Demographics, Transportation Options, and Consumer Preferences

US Public Transit Ridership

Between 2004-2012

Transit Ridership
14%

US population
6%

Vehicle Miles
1%

Source: APTA 2013
Changing Demographics, Transportation Options, and Consumer Preferences

Vehicle Ownership
Alexandria Households

- 0 or 1 vehicle: 62%
- 2 vehicles: 32%
- 3+: 6%

“Car-Light” Households
Fairfax 25%
US 43%
Alexandria 62%
Arlington 63%

Senior Households
In Alexandria, 18% have no car, compared to 10% citywide, and 13% nationally.

Millennials
In 1983, 87% of US 19 year olds had a driver’s license.
In 2010, 69% were driving.

Source: US Census Bureau
Efficient Use of Land Resources

1 Parking Space = 300 sq. ft.

Meridian at Braddock Station

1 Mini Street Park

10 Bike Parking
Parking Impacts Urban Design

Old Town North

Braddock Metro Neighborhood

Alexandria West

Beauregard
Parking is Expensive

1 Underground Parking Space = $35,000-50,000 per space

718 unused parking spaces at 8 data collection sites near Metro. Equates to 210,000sf, almost 5 acres of vacant parking.

Price tag: $21.5 - $35.9M
Parking is Expensive

Jackson Crossing (Under construction)
• 78-unit affordable housing development project
Parking - Impervious Surfaces Impact Water and Air Quality
Neighboring Jurisdictions are Right Sizing

- DC: Lower ratios in various zones; studying multi-family parking standards, developing “Parking Calculator” tool to account for demand factors similar to current Alexandria proposal.

- Montgomery: New multi-family standards enacted 2015; lower ratios for projects within “Parking Lot Districts” and “Reduced Parking Areas” take factors into account.

- Arlington: Currently studying multi-family parking standards; data collection underway.
City’s Practice has been to Right-Size Parking

We have been solving the problem with SUPs.

- From 2000 - 2010 City Council considered 49 DSUPs for Residential and Residential/Mixed-Use Projects
  - Of those, 16 projects or 33% of all DSUP applications requested Parking Reduction SUPs.
    - All requests were granted
Revising Parking Standard Will Not Impact Public Benefits
Draft Market Rate Housing Parking Ratio

Location-Specific Starting Ratio

Within Metro Walkshed: 0.8 space per bedroom

Outside Metro Walkshed: 1.0 space per bedroom
Within Metro Walkshed  0.8 space per bedroom
With applicable credits can go to .64 per bedroom

• 5% for bus routes
• 10% or 5% for walkability
• 5% for studios
Draft Market Rate Housing Parking Ratio
Location-Specific Allowable Credits

Outside Metro Walkshed: 1.0 space per bedroom
With applicable credits, can go to .70 per bedroom
- 10% for BRT stop
- 5% for studios
- 10% or 5% for walkability
- 5% for bus routes
Draft Recommendation: Affordable Housing

*Income-Restricted Units*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INCOME SERVED</th>
<th>STARTING PARKING RATIO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Units at 60% Area Median Income</td>
<td>0.75 space/unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Units at 50% Area Median Income</td>
<td>0.65 space/unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Units at 30% Area Median Income</td>
<td>0.50 space/unit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Within Metro/BRT Walkshed: .68-.45/unit based on AMI and applicable credits
Outside Metro/BRT Walkshed: .75-.40/unit based on AMI and applicable credits
Common Questions

- Comparison to current standards
- Per bedroom measurement - definition
- On-street parking
- Parking maximum
- Visitor parking
- Clarity
City Council Work Session
Follow up

- Administrative Approvals for Shared Parking
- Council Review of Development Applications
- Applicability
- Community benefits
Implementation

Request: Explore options that maximize community benefits

Staff Recommendation:

*Text amendment to the Zoning Ordinance*

- Aligns parking regulations with current City plans and practice
- Increases transparency about requirements, adding certainty for the community and developers
- Reduces # of parking reduction SUP requests for multi-family housing, prioritizing City staff resources for other tasks
- Continue to receive community benefits to mitigate impacts of development

Alternative:

- Interim pilot of proposed recommendation could be tested until commercial phase of the Parking Study is completed
- Challenges: Staff and Council continue to review parking reductions on a project by project basis, less transparency and certainty for public/developers; policy has less authority than regulation; outdated parking ratios remain in ZO
Endorsements

_Draft Recommendation, as a Text Amendment, is endorsed by:_

- _Parking Standards for New Development Projects Task Force_
- _Environmental Policy Commission_
- _Transportation Commission_
- _Affordable Housing Advisory Committee_
Background Slides
Parking Study Scope and Process
Fall 2013 – Spring 2015

Data Collection & Analysis

- On-site parking counts
- Best Practices

Public Input

- "Why Right-Sized Parking Matters"
- Task Force Public Meetings
- Federation
- NAIOP
- EPC
- AHAC

Work Sessions

Revised Draft Recommendations

- Transportation Commission
- Planning Commission
- City Council

Public Hearings
Consistency with City Plans

City Council Strategic Plan
• Goal 1: Alexandria has quality development and redevelopment, support for local businesses and a strong, diverse and growing local economy.
• Goal 3: A multimodal transportation network that supports sustainable land use and provides internal mobility and regional connectivity for Alexandrians.

Transportation Master Plan
• “The City will develop and implement comprehensive guidelines and requirements for transit-oriented development (TOD) that support the principles of TOD and include maximum parking ratios, unbundled parking infrastructure, and parking cash-out programs as parking management strategies for development/redevelopment of properties proximate to Metrorail stations.”

Housing Master Plan
• “Establish a policy for the reduction of parking requirements in projects that meet minimum thresholds of affordable housing.”

Eco-City Charter
• “Where our built environment preserves and maximizes open spaces, natural landscapes, historic resources, and recreational opportunities, while protecting and improving our natural environment and public health...Where we travel less and less by car and increasingly by mass transit, walking, and bicycling.”
Draft Recommendation: Market-Rate Housing Compared to Current Zoning Ordinance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># of BR</th>
<th>Current Zoning Ordinance</th>
<th>Draft Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Within 0.5 mile of Metro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1BR Unit</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.64 - 0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2BR Unit</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>1.28 - 1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3BR Unit</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.92 - 2.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Walkability Index

- Performance-based index
- Measures pedestrian access to diverse land uses
- Utilizes walking distance, requires adequate sidewalks
- 0.25 & 0.5 mile thresholds
- Hybrid of Walkscore’s point system and LEED’s rigorous methodology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Max. Points</th>
<th>Use or Service Type</th>
<th>0.25 mi. or less</th>
<th>0.25 - 0.5 mi.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Food Retail</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Supermarket or grocery with produce section (min. 5,000 gross square footage)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community-serving retail</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Convenience Store</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Farmers Market (min. 9 months per year)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hardware store</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other retail</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Bank (not ATM)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Family entertainment venue (e.g. theater, sports)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gym, health club, exercise studio</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hair care</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Laundry, dry cleaner</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Restaurant, café, diner (excluding those with only drive-thru only service)*</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic and community facilities</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Adult or senior care (licensed)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Child care (licensed)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cultural arts facility (museum, performing arts)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Education facility (e.g. K-12 school)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Education facility (e.g. university, adult education center, vocational school, community college)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Government office that serves public on-site</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Medical clinic or office that treats patients</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Place of worship</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Police or fire station</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Post office</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Public library</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Public park</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Social services center</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community anchor uses</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Business office (100 or more FTE)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Draft Walkability Index: Sample Map

- Shows multi-family building
- Identifies uses (schools, retail, office buildings, etc.)
- Illustrates walkshed or walking route
- Includes scale or distance measure
- Easily replicable
- Easily verifiable
- Google map, Yelp map, GIS, etc.
Guiding Document:
User’s Guide to Applying New Standards
## Local Jurisdiction Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Multifamily Parking Ratio Requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arlington</td>
<td>1.125/Unit for first 200 Units plus 1.0/Unit for each additional Unit; Many special exceptions in transit areas; 1.0/Unit Columbia Pike; .825/Affordable Housing (AH) Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC</td>
<td>Varies from .25-1.0/Unit depending on zones; no separate AH ratio; revisions for significantly lower ratios currently in process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montgomery</td>
<td>In parking districts, allow for ranges based on # of bedrooms: Efficiency .50-1.0/Unit; 1 BR .50-1.25/Unit; 2 BR .75-1.5/Unit; 3 BR 1.0-2.0/Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexandria (Proposed)</td>
<td>Less than ½ mile from Metro – base ratio .80/BR with potential credits and Minimum of .64/BR; More than ½ mile from Metro – base ratio 1.0/BR with potential credits and Minimum of .70/BR; AH base ratio - .75/Unit with potential credits and Minimum of .35/Unit.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Draft Recommendation: Market-Rate Housing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT LOCATION</th>
<th>STARTING PARKING RATIO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Within 0.5 mile Metro Station Walkshed</td>
<td>0.8 space/bedroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside of 0.5 mile of Metro Station Walkshed</td>
<td>1.0 space/bedroom</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Draft Recommendation: Market-Rate Housing

Optional Credits, or Deductions, on the Starting Ratios

• Located within ½ mile of BRT Stop: 10%
  *Only if located outside of the ½ mile Metro Walkshed*

• Located within ¼ mile of 4 or More Bus Routes: 5%

• Walkability Index Score Very High/High: 10% or 5%

• 20% or More of the Units are Studio Units: 5%
Draft Recommendation: Affordable Housing

*Income-Restricted Units*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INCOME SERVED</th>
<th>STARTING PARKING RATIO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Units at 60% Area Median Income</td>
<td>0.75 space/unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Units at 50% Area Median Income</td>
<td>0.65 space/unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Units at 30% Area Median Income</td>
<td>0.50 space/unit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Draft Recommendation: Affordable Housing

*Income-Restricted Units*

Optional Credits, or Deductions, on the Starting Ratios

- Located within ½ mile of Metro or BRT Stop: 10%
- Walkability Index Score Very High/High: 10% or 5%
- Located within ¼ mile of 4 or More Bus Routes: 5%
- 20% or More of the Units are Studio Units: 5%
## DATA COLLECTION FINDINGS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property Name</th>
<th>Distance from Metro</th>
<th># of Dwelling Units</th>
<th>Car ownership</th>
<th>Average Per Unit Demand Based Parking Ratio</th>
<th>Average Per Bedroom Demand Based Parking Ratio</th>
<th>Construction Year</th>
<th>DSUP Conditions</th>
<th>Fee for On-site Parking ($)</th>
<th>Occasional (%)</th>
<th>Average On-street Occupancy (%)</th>
<th>% Studio</th>
<th>% 1 bd</th>
<th>% 2 bd</th>
<th>% 3 bd</th>
<th># of Bus Routes Serving the Area</th>
<th>Walk Score</th>
<th>Bike Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site A1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>$75</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site A2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>$75</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site A3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>$75</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site A4 (5)</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site A5 (1)</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td><strong>1.0</strong></td>
<td>193</td>
<td><strong>0.7</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site B1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>$75</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site B2 (1)</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site B3 (1)(2)</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site B4 (1)</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site B5 (1)(2)</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td><strong>1.3</strong></td>
<td><strong>138</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.7</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site C1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site C2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site C3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>588</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site C4</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site C5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1946</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site C6</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>547</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>665</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td><strong>1.3</strong></td>
<td><strong>380</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.9</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1) Condo
2) Counts were adjusted based on car ownershership data provided by Finance Department
3) Development Special Use Permit (DSUP) conditions prohibiting residents from obtaining a Residential Parking Permit
4) Source: http://www.walkscore.com
5) Parking fee is $100 per month for a reserved parking space. Residents can also pay $70 for a non-reserved space
Administrative Approvals
Shared Parking

• Request: investigate streamlined modification to parking requirements in existing approvals
• Eg: Potomac Yard Fire Station
• Limited opportunities for administrative amendments to approved DSUPs, however staff is investigating options, and will present a recommendation when a proposal is ready
Council Purview

- Council will continue to review majority of development cases; few are parking reductions only
- One of the recommendation’s originally proposed credits (5%) was removed to retain Council oversight beyond allowed range
- Requests to park below minimum ratio (after credits) or above starting ratio, will require a parking modification SUP
- With SUPs, Council can require mitigation of negative impacts to transportation network and community
Clarity

• New approach is more complex than current regulations
• Necessary to achieve goals of “right-sizing” the parking ratios and making them context sensitive to project locations and parking demand factors
• Draft *Guiding Document provides* greater detail and guidance for applying the new ratios and credits, interpreting the walkshed maps, and using the walkability index
Parking Maximum

- Proposal establishes one ratio (0.8 per bedroom) for projects within the 0.5 mile Metro Walkshed and another ratio (1.0) for projects outside the 0.5 mile Metro Walkshed.
- May utilize eligible credits to go as low as .64 and .70 respectively, without an SUP.
- In some cases, applicants may wish to provide more parking than established ratio; will require parking modification SUP.
- General support for maximum (Parking TF, with some opposition, TC, EPC)
On-Street Parking

• Community concern about spillover parking onto neighborhood streets
• Proposed ratios were developed to avoid this impact, and include a buffer over and above demand to ensure adequate percentage of empty spaces within garages
• Some suggest that residents of new projects not be allowed on-street parking permit stickers. City no longer uses this practice with new development applications.
• Parking Districts and On-Street Permit Parking not within scope of this study, but will be addressed through Old Town Area Parking Study.
Visitor parking

• Proposed starting ratios are inclusive of visitor parking. Ratios were informed by data collection which included a count of all cars in the lot, whether visitors or residents. In addition to incorporating existing visitor parking, the starting parking ratios also incorporate a 10% buffer above existing utilization to allow for increase in demand.

• City’s current practice (not a requirement) is that developers provide 15% visitor parking, either on-site or on new streets created by the development.

• Guiding document recommends that projects set aside 5-10% of their parking spaces for visitors.