

ATTACHMENT 4

Parking Issues to Consider for Joint Workshop		
Item	Issue	Current Code/Enabling Policy
Parking Standards		
1. Affordable Housing		
A. Very Low Income	<p>Should the City develop “efficiency-based” parking standards which could allow for further reductions based on specific criteria, for instance if development is within a transit area? Should the City further reduce ratios?</p> <p>The current reduction is modest. Conventional parking requirements impose costs on development and decrease affordability of housing. Research by others suggests that residents of affordable housing tend to own fewer cars than the average and are more likely to use alternative travel modes¹. The City may consider establishing more accurate efficiency-based parking standards that would allow parking requirements at a particular location be adjusted to account for the geographic location, income, transit accessibility, types of units, etc.</p>	142.0505; 142.0525 a
B. Low Income	<p>Should the City offer incentives for Low income housing? See description above for ‘1-A. Very Low Income’</p>	None
C. Moderate Income	<p>Should the City offer incentives for Moderate income housing? See description above for ‘1-A. Very Low Income’</p>	None
D. Living Units	<p>Should the City reduce requirements?</p> <p>There are several factors that contribute to excessive parking supply including the fact that parking requirements imposed on new developments are often used to mitigate existing neighborhood deficiencies rather than implementing parking management strategies/programs in those areas. The City may consider establishing more accurate efficiency-based parking standards that would allow parking requirements at a particular location be adjusted to account for the geographic location, income, transit accessibility, types of units, etc.</p>	None
E. Companion Units	<p>Should the City reduce requirements? See description above for ‘1-D. Living Units’</p>	141.0302

¹ Litman, Todd. Parking Management Best Practices. American Planning Association, 2006.

ATTACHMENT 4

Parking Issues to Consider for Joint Workshop		
Item	Issue	Current Code/Enabling Policy
F. Senior Citizens	Should the City reduce requirements? See description above for '1-D. Living Units'	141.0310 142.0520
2. Market Rate Units	Should the City validate ratios based on newer data/factors? Efficiency-based parking standards could be implemented that would allow for more flexible and accurate parking requirements at a particular location given criteria such as geographic location, income, transit accessibility, types of units, etc.	142.0505; 142.0525a
3. Density bonus	Should the City encourage developers to use tandem or uncovered parking to meet parking standards? State law limits parking standards applied by the City. The City may consider adding specific categories of parking deviations that are allowed when granting a density bonus. An example would be to allow tandem parking to count toward the minimum parking requirements in areas where tandem parking is not currently permitted. This strategy would increase on-site parking capacity without additional land or construction costs.	143.0740 143.0750
4. Condo Conversion	Should the City adopt provisions to address previously conforming & constrained sites? See description above for '1D. Living Units'	144.0507 f; 142.0525 a
5. Urban Village	Should the City adopt different shared parking ratios that are sensitive to parking trends in mixed use areas? See description above for '1D. Living Units'	142.0525 a; 142.0530
6. Shared Parking	i.) Should the City update shared parking ratios such as hour of day? ii.) Should the City require parking in new development to be shared among uses with different parking demands as a condition of approval? iii.) Should the City require parking in new development to be made available for public parking when not needed for its primary use as a condition of approval? Shared parking among uses can reduce parking facility costs, allow for more creative site design and location selection, as well as creates more compact land use. The City may consider encouraging "park-once" trips where motorists park at one location but can walk to multiple destinations.	142.0525 b; 142.0545

ATTACHMENT 4

Parking Issues to Consider for Joint Workshop		
Item	Issue	Current Code/Enabling Policy
7. TDM	Should the City remove requirements to have developers set aside land if 15% reduction cannot be met?	142.0540 c
8. Tandem	Should the City expand the use of tandem parking? See description above for '3. Density Bonus'	132.0901; 132.0902;132.0905; 142.0555
9. Transit areas	<p>i.) Should the City update the Transit Area Overlay map to reflect proposals contained in the Proposed General Plan Amendment?</p> <p>ii.) Should the City further reduce ratios for developments w/in TAOZ? The Transit Area Overlay zone had been modified over the years without clear criteria adopted and agreed to by the City Council. The General Plan is revisiting the criteria to establish a transit corridor. The overlay zone should be consistent with the new criteria once adopted by City Council.</p>	132.1001;132.1002; 142.0525 a; 142.0530
10. Physical parking dimensions	<p>Should the City revise standards to allow for more flexibility in parking lot design to accommodate constrained sites?</p> <p>Restrictions such as driveway widths, parking stall dimensions, driveway gradients can make it difficult to allow the number of dwelling units that are permitted on a given site due to the layout of the lot, the topography, or adjacent conditions. Allowing limited deviations to these restrictions to allow the residential density permitted by the zone would allow the creation of more units.</p>	142.0560
11. Eating/drinking establishments	<p>Should the City standardize ratios specified in the different Citywide and in the PDO's?</p> <p>The current parking standards have 10 different parking requirements for eating and drinking establishments depending on where they are in the City. These ratios could be standardized for this use citywide consistent with established parking data for this land use.</p>	142.0525 a; 142.0530 b

ATTACHMENT 4

Parking Issues to Consider for Joint Workshop		
Item	Issue	Current Code/Enabling Policy
Parking Management		
12. Adjust meter rates for 85% occupancy	<p>Should the City expand the DPMG pilot program and adopt an ordinance to allow for the adjustment of meter rates and times by zone to achieve 85 percent occupancy within community parking districts?</p> <p>The City and the Downtown Parking Management Group (DPMG) has successfully completed a year-long pilot program which increased the utilization of some parking meter spaces up to 200 percent. Under the pilot program the DPMG has the authority to adjust hourly meter rates and time limits to achieve a target occupancy rate of 85 percent. The goal is to use price to affect parking and travel demand.</p>	O-19336
13. Set a range for meter rates	<p>Should the City build on the success of the DPMG and establish a range for the meter rates from \$.25 to \$3.00 per hour that may be applied without Council action?</p> <p>The citywide parking meter rate is \$1.25 per hour regardless of the location or utilization. However, under the downtown pilot program the DPMG used price to manage the parking demand in selected areas. The DPMG has successfully increased hourly rates to encourage long-term parking users to park in off-street locations, freeing on-street spaces for short-term customers/visitors and increasing parking turnover. In addition, lowering the rates has boosted the occupancy of under-utilized meters and increase parking meter revenue.</p>	O-19336
14. Extend Meter Hours	<p>Should the City extend the hours of operation beyond 6pm for metered parking spaces in high demand areas?</p> <p>All city meters operate from 8am to 6pm, Monday through Saturday. However, in commercial areas with entertainment and eat/drink establishments where there is high parking demand and significant traffic congestion meters hours may be extended to encourage parking turnover and improve circulation during peak evening hours. In addition, extending meters could generate upwards of \$9 million in gross annual revenue for the CPDs and the City.</p>	Council Policy 200-04, and Muni Code §86.04 & §82.04
15. Replace Old Meters	<p>Should the City replace old single-head meters and install networked multi-space pay stations citywide?</p> <p>The City has successfully completed a year-long pilot program which included the installation of 50 multi-space pay stations in the downtown area. City staff reported a 24 percent increase in parking meter revenue, positive public acceptance, and improved management given the real-time</p>	None

ATTACHMENT 4

Parking Issues to Consider for Joint Workshop		
Item	Issue	Current Code/Enabling Policy
	technology to track utilization of the metered spaces. The Parking Operations staff has found the technology beneficial to the public and City's management of the parking resources.	
16. Add new on-street paid parking spaces	<p>Should the City support the Community Parking Districts' recommendations to install new pay stations in La Jolla, Old Town and Pacific Beach to promote parking turnover, increase access and improve circulation?</p> <p>Currently there are no meters in La Jolla, Old Town or Pacific Beach. However, parking studies have demonstrated there are significant parking impacts in these communities. Employees tend to utilize free on-street parking leaving customers/visitors to cruise for parking spaces for extended periods of time creating congestion and pollution. Installing pay stations will shift long-term parkers to off-street locations, encourage parking turnover, and generate revenue to fund shuttles or transit passes.</p>	Council Policy 100-18
17. Create new Community Parking Districts	<p>Should the City create a Community Parking District for Mission Bay Park and Balboa Park and dedicate 100 percent of the parking revenue to each park to fund improvements, shuttle services and other transportation projects?</p> <p>Parking in Mission Bay Park and Balboa Park is free; however, to manage the parking demand and increase revenue for improvements, shuttles and other transportation projects the City may consider installing multi-space pay stations. All parking meter revenue – 100 percent – could be retained in separate funds for each park to fund improvements as advised by a local group of stakeholders. Approximately \$20 million in gross annual revenue could be generated for both parks.</p>	Council Policy 100-18
19. Valet Parking	<p>Should the City enter into a contractual arrangement/lease with one or more valet parking operators for citywide service?</p> <p>The City may consider controlling the valet operators and the public parking spaces they utilize. Currently the City charges valet operators the administrative cost of acquiring a valet parking permit, equivalent to \$300 annually. The City may consider establishing a contract arrangement with one or more valet operators by creating an RFP that outlines the services expected, the revenue share between the operator and the City.</p>	Muni Code §86.2201-§86.2208; and Council Policy 200-15

ATTACHMENT 4

Parking Issues to Consider for Joint Workshop		
Item	Issue	Current Code/Enabling Policy
20. Way-finding	<p>Should the City implement a multi-modal transportation and parking way-finding system?</p> <p>The City lacks a formal way-finding system. A way-finding system could help to direct motorists to unseen parking locations, guide pedestrians and cyclists to transit centers. A way-find system offer information to reduce anxiety to find parking and facilitates the use of alternative modes of transportation.</p>	GP, ME-D&G
21. Car-sharing	<p>Should the City implement a car-sharing program?</p> <p>Car-sharing works like a rental service that substitutes for private vehicle ownership. Cars are located in residential and transportation centers and paid by the user. A car-sharing service can reduce parking requirements by 5 to 10 percent². SANDAG and CCDC have been working with Flexcar to promote car-sharing as an alternative form of transportation. The program has been successful with studies demonstrating 10 to 15 cars being removed from the street for every one shared car³. The City may consider implementing a car-sharing program and dedicate 10 on-street parking locations in downtown for a car-sharing program.</p>	CA Vehicle Code 22507.1
22. Hybrid parking	<p>Should the City implement preferential parking for hybrid vehicles?</p> <p>The Natural Resource and Culture proposed reserving a small percentage of preferred parking spaces within city-owned parking facilities for hybrid/low-emissions vehicles to encourage San Diego residents to use hybrid vehicles thereby reducing pollution levels and taking action against global warming. The City may consider evaluating this proposal to implement a program that would visibly promote this technology.</p>	GP, CE-A

² Litman, Todd. Parking Management Best Practices. American Planning Association, 2006.

³ Transit Cooperative Research Program Car Sharing: Where and How It Succeeds http://onlinepubs.trb.org/onlinepubs/terp/terp_rpt_108.pdf, 2005.