



**PARKING STANDARDS FOR NEW DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS**  
**TASK FORCE MEETING #5**  
Thursday, March 12, 2015; 7PM  
Room 2000, Alexandria City Hall, 301 King Street

**Meeting Summary**

*Meeting summary is developed by City staff to provide a written record of principal items of discussion and comments from the public. They are not intended to be a verbatim transcription of the meeting.*

**Task Force Members**

Nathan Macek, Chairperson  
Kerry Donley, Transportation Commission Representative  
James Lewis, Traffic and Parking Board  
John Gosling, Former Old Town Area Parking Study Work Group  
Cathy Puskar, At-Large Alexandria Resident  
Michael Workosky, NAIOP, The Commercial Real Estate Development Association  
Danielle Fidler, At-Large Alexandria Resident  
Stewart Bartley, Mixed-Use Developer  
Andrea Hamre, At-Large Alexandria Resident, *Absent*

**City Staff**

Helen McIlvaine, Acting Director, Office of Housing  
Sandra Marks, Deputy Director, Transportation & Environmental Services  
Susan Eddy, Deputy Director, Planning and Zoning  
Carrie Beach, Division Chief, Planning & Zoning  
Brandi Collins, Urban Planner III, P&Z

**AGENDA**

1. Welcome & Introductions
2. Staff Presentation
  - a. Feedback from Work Sessions and NAIOP Meeting
  - b. Revised Draft Recommendations
  - c. Implementation
  - d. Additional Updates (Walkshed Maps, Walkability Index, Guiding Document)
3. Task Force Discussion
4. Public Comment
5. Task Force Recommendation
6. Next Steps

***WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS***

Nathan Macek welcomed the meeting attendees and called the meeting to order.

## ***STAFF PRESENTATION***

Staff's full presentation can be found on the project webpage (<http://www.alexandriava.gov/planning/info/default.aspx?id=76333>) and by accessing this [link](#).

### *Feedback from Work Sessions and NAIOP Meeting*

Staff provided a presentation that covered the feedback provided during work sessions with Transportation Commission, Planning Commission, and City Council. Staff consulted with the three bodies on the draft parking recommendations in December 2014 and January 2015. Overall, the three bodies were supportive of the concept but had concerns regarding the following:

- Capturing visitor parking and practical capacity
- Recommendation should be presented more clearly
- Process for modifications to the parking ratio
- Clarity on defining distances to metro in the walkshed maps
- Translate developer cost savings from lessened parking requirements to community benefits
- Concern regarding loss of City Council oversight on parking for development projects
- Study on-street parking management and the design of garages (Note: these items are not within the scope of this parking study)

In addition, staff consulted with NAIOP, The Commercial Real Estate Development Association, whose representatives provided the following feedback on the draft recommendations:

- Present the affordable housing recommendations more clearly
- Consider excluding affordable housing from the additional credits
- Consider removing the 5% discretionary credit and make it subject to a Special Use Permit coupled with developer mitigation

*Staff Presented the Current Version of Draft Recommendations.*

Table 1. Market-Rate Parking Ratios

<b>Development Project Location</b>	<b>Parking Ratio</b>
Project located within .5 mile of Metro Station walkshed	0.8 space/bedroom
Project located outside of .5 mile Metro Station walkshed	1.0 space/bedroom

Table 2. Market-Rate Allowable Credits

<b>Allowable Credits on Parking Ratios</b>	
Project located outside 0.5 mile Metro Station walkshed but within 0.5 mile BRT stop walkshed	10%
Walkability Index score is between 90-100	10%
Walkability Index score is between 80-89	5%
Four or more bus routes stop within .25 mile of development entrance	5%
Development project has 20% or more studio units	5%

Table 3. Income-Restricted Affordable Housing Parking Ratios

Household Income Being Served	Parking Ratio
Housing Units Affordable at 60% AMI	0.75 space/unit
Housing Units Affordable at 50% AMI	0.65 space/unit
Housing Units Affordable at 30% AMI	0.50 space/unit

Table 4. Income-Restricted Affordable Housing Allowable credits

Allowable Credits on Parking Ratios	
Project located within 0.5 mile Metro Station walkshed OR the 0.5 mile BRT stop walkshed	10%
Walkability Index score is between 90-100	10%
Walkability Index score is between 80-89	5%
Four or more bus routes stop within .25 mile of development project entrance	5%
Development project has 20% or more studio units	5%

*Implementation Options*

The original objective of the parking study was to update the Zoning Ordinance’s parking requirements. However, during the work session, some members of City Council expressed concern that an update to the ordinance would remove City Council’s purview over parking requirements for new development projects. After consideration and research of alternative options for implementation, staff determined that a text amendment to the Zoning Ordinance is the best approach. The majority of development projects are submitted for approval to the City as a Development Special Use Permit (DSUP). City Council reviews all DSUP applications and can, therefore, provide input on any aspect of a development project. Also, updating the zoning ordinance parking requirements increases transparency and provides certainty for the public and developers. Lastly, updating the parking requirements aligns the City’s regulations with current practice and City policy.

The Task Force agreed that a Zoning Ordinance Text Amendment is the best option.

*Additional Updates*

Staff provided updates on the Metro Walkshed Map, Bus Rapid Transit Stop Walkshed Map, Draft Walkability Index, and Guiding Document. The Task Force had comments regarding the Walkability Index; which was described in concept, and the Guiding Document, which was still in draft form and had not yet been provided to the Task Force. The Guiding Document is almost complete and will be emailed to the Task Force and posted on the project webpage next week.

**TASK FORCE DISCUSSION**

The Task Force was asked to provide comments on the following decision points:

- *Draft Recommendations*
- *Contents of Draft Text Amendment*
- *Implementation Approach*

**Task Force feedback on Draft Recommendations:**

- Agree in concept with the draft parking ratios and credits
- Would like to review the Guiding Document (Users Guide)

**Task Force feedback on Implementation Approach:**

- Agree and recommend that the draft recommendation be implemented as a Zoning Text Amendment (not policy)

**Task Force feedback on Draft Text Amendment language:**

- The Task Force members would like to review a revised Draft Text Amendment before recommending the draft recommendations for approval by the City Council.
- Section 8-200(A)(2)(a)i, Section 8-200(2)(a) – Text should include “up to” in front of the text regarding the parking ratios for “each bedroom over two”.
- Remove the word “base” in front of “parking ratio”.
- Section 8-200(A)(2)(a)iii – Remove the word “lowered”.
- Section 8-200(F)(1)(c) – Text is confusing because 1) it implies that the units covered in Section 8-200(A)(2)(a) cannot apply credits, 2) the use of the word “maximum” is incorrect because there is de facto maximum created by the draft recommendations, 3) this exempts units discussed in Section 7-700 but that ZO section may actually require more parking than the draft recommendation and is that the intention.
  - If the use of the work “maximum” is to create a “grandfathering” of existing parking that may be in excess of the new standard create another way to say that.
- Affordable housing exempt from draft recommendations per Section 8-200(F)(4)(a) may be offered lower parking ratios under the draft recommendations but would not be allowed to take advantage of those standards.
- Section 8-100(A)(7) – remove the word “less” because less is covered in Section 8-100(A)(4).
- Section 6-703 requires one parking space per residential unit in the KR zone (same as the King Street Transit Parking District) – Should we change that as well? Note: the Task Force Member stated that the KR zone required “zero” parking for residential and did not want to change that.
- Revise definition of Walkability Index – replace “tool” to be more specific.

**During the discussion, the Task Force raised additional concerns:**

*Parking Maximums*

- Creating parking “maximums” was a source of lengthy debate, covering the following pros and cons:
  - Parking maximum is not necessary. The market will determine the upper limit of parking needed, and developers should not have to seek a special use permit modification to be allowed to provide more parking.

- It is good public policy for the City to send the signal that excess parking, particularly around metro stations, should be discouraged. Providing more parking can induce demand, and induce the use of more vehicles on City streets, with traffic and environmental impacts.
- Ultimately, the group consensus was to retain the parking maximum, but to be explicit about that limitation in the text amendment and in the Guiding Document.

*Other*

- Q: How will staff regulate parking requirement for townhouse-style condos? They function as townhomes and not as multi-family. Staff Response: They will continue to be counted as townhomes per the zoning ordinance and current practice.

*Walkability Index:*

- Can the walkability index include improvements that are being provided within a new project (sidewalk, grocery)?
- Specify who is doing the work of researching the walkability index score.
- Add “other” as a category in the Use Types and Categories chart that can be at the discretion of the Director of PZ (e.g. to all credits for doggie daycare, etc.).
- Allow developers to “square off blocks” if they use a walkshed buffer to determine uses and service types to be counted.
- Specify when new Bus Rapid Transit stops and new Metro Station credits would be available – operational vs. under construction.

By the end of the discussion, the **Task Force reached consensus** on the following:

- Endorsement of the final draft recommendation as proposed and implementation through a Zoning Ordinance text amendment to update the parking standards, subject to final review and feedback of the revised text amendment and Guiding Document.
- Task Force will hold a follow up meeting on March 24 to provide a final recommendation.
- When drafts are complete, staff will provide items for review during the week of March 16.

***PUBLIC COMMENT***

- Once transit is under construction, the DSUP should receive the BRT or Metro Walkshed credit.
- Placing maximums on parking ratios are good City policy.