

PARKING STUDY

January 27, 2021, CNPC Meeting



BACKGROUND

GOALS OF THE STUDY

To help implement the climate action plan. Climate action plan calls for carbon neutrality by 2050.
In Saint Paul, single-occupant trips are the most prevalent mode of transportation and, according to the Climate Action & Resilience Plan, 31% of Saint Paul's emissions

can be attributed to vehicle travel.

GOALS OF THE STUDY

To Implement comprehensive plan policies

- **Policy LU-13.** Support strategies, as context and technology allow, to improve offstreet parking efficiency, such as shared parking agreements, district ramps, car sharing, electric vehicle charging and **reduced parking overall.**
- Policy LU-14. Reduce the amount of land devoted to off-street parking in order to use land more efficiently, accommodate increases in density on valuable urban land, and promote the use of transit and other non-car mobility modes.
- **Policy LU-15.** Ensure that stand-alone parking uses are limited, and that structured parking is mixed-use and/or convertible to other uses.
- **Policy LU-31**. Invest in Neighborhood Nodes to achieve development that enables people to meet their daily needs within walking distance and improves equitable access to amenities, retail and services.
- Policy T-17. Use pricing to manage parking demand and improve parking efficiency in areas with high demand and short supply.
- Policy T-21. Reduce vehicle miles traveled (VMT) by 40% by 2040 by improving transportation options beyond single-occupant vehicles.
- **Policy T-22.** Shift mode share towards walking, biking, public transit, carpooling, ridesharing and carsharing in order to reduce the need for car ownership.

GOALS OF THE Study

•Policy H-8. Encourage creativity in building design and site layout.

•Policy H-18. Foster the preservation and production of deeply affordable rental housing (housing affordable to those at 30% or less of the Area Median Income or AMI), supportive housing and housing for people experiencing homelessness.

•Policy H-31. Support the development of **new affordable housing units** throughout the city.

•Policy H-46. Support the development of new housing, particularly in areas identified as Mixed Use, Urban Neighborhoods, and/or in areas with the highest existing or planned transit service, to meet market demand for **living in walkable**, transit-accessible, urban neighborhoods.

THE TWO OPTIONS

 One option eliminates minimum parking requirements (article II amendments)

 One option reduces minimums through targeted exemptions and reductions (article II amendments)

 Both options decouple bike parking requirements from vehicular parking requirements

Both options proposed amendments the travel demand manage (TDM) ordinance and a new supplemental TDM program guide

Both options proposed to streamline processes and standards for parking (article III amendments)

The other amendments in chapter 60, 61, 65, and 66 are intended to complement the other amendments.

WHAT THIS STUDY AND PROPOSED AMENDMENTS DON'T **ADDRESS**

 On-street parking policy and ordinances (zoning generally regulates off-street parking)

• Fee in Lieu provisions and parking benefit districts (was in the original scope)

- College Parking requirements (was in the original scope)
- Bike parking design standards

INTRO TO THE STUDY AND POLICY CONSIDERATIONS

Climate change and carbon emissions

Housing

- Economic Development
- Market Value and Tax Revenues
- Travel Demand Management
- Off street parking production



AUTO CENTRIC LAND USE PATTERN OF SAINT PAUL



The urban form and density of a city is inextricably linked to a city's carbon output per capita because the urban form of a city dictates travel behavior.

ROUGHLY 631.2 ACRES OF GARAGE SPACE IN SAINT PAUL



ROUGHLY 2,659 ACRES OF SURFACE PARKING



ROUGHLY <u>8,560</u> ACRES OF RIGHT-OF-WAY



ABOUT 35.6% OF SAINT PAUL'S <u>LAND AREA</u> IS DEDICATED PRIMARILY TO THE PURPOSE OF MOVING AND STORING AUTOMOBILES



WHEN PARKING MINIMUMS WERE ADOPTED



1954

Roughly 75% of structures in Saint Paul with one or more units were built prior to 1954, and

the one space per residential unit minimum parking requirement was introduced to the zoning code in 1954.



1975

Roughly 70% of structures without a residential unit were built before 1975, and minimum parking requirements were expanded to commercial, industrial, and institutional uses in 1975.

PARKING REQUIREMENTS ILLUSTRATED

BAR PARKING REQUIREMENT: 1 space per 150 square feet, would result in a site build out where at a minimum 63% of the new development's area would be used for parking and 37% would be used for the building that the parking serves.

THE MAJORITY OF COMMERCIAL USES: 1 space per 400 square feet would result in a development where a minimum of **39% of the development's area would be used for parking and 61% of the development's area would be used for a building.**



HOW THIS INFLUENCES TRAVEL BEHAVIOR

Figure 1 Cycle of Automobile Dependency



When minimum parking requirements are applied broadly, they ultimately increase the demand for off street parking because the resulting reduced density and the increased distance between land uses makes walking, biking, and public transportation less viable modes of transportation.

THE IRONY OF MINIMUM PARKING REQUIREMENTS

By necessitating single occupancy vehicle trips due to the reduced density caused by requiring off street parking, off street parking facilities ironically contribute to off street parking demand.

THIS CAN BE COMPOUNDED IF PARKING MINIMUMS LEAD TO AN OVER SUPPLY OF PARKING!





Parking Usage at Peak: 59% of total supply



Parking Usage at Peak: 59% full



Parking Usage at Peak: 33% full



Parking Usage at Peak: 44% full

WHY PARKING REQUIREMENTS MAY RESULT IN OVER SUPPLY PARKING

- When parking minimums were originally developed an over supply of parking was preferable to an under-supply of parking, minimum parking requirements were designed to be inherently conservative in order to accommodate potentially infrequent peak demands for <u>free</u> off-street parking.
- 2. Parking requirements are blunt instruments which are often determined by one factor that may influence off street parking demand, such as the square footage of a commercial use or the number of residential units in a development.

OTHER FACTORS THAT MAY INFLUENCE PARKING DEMAND

surrounding density and mix of land uses nearby

- the price of parking
- access to public transportation
- the frequency and mode of public transportation
- commercial trade areas
- nearby infrastructure
- income levels
- vehicle ownership rates
- flexible work schedules
- telecommuting
- sales volume
- and many more





INTRO TO THE STUDY AND POLICY CONSIDERATIONS

Climate change and carbon emissions

Housing

Economic Development

Market Value and Tax Revenues

Travel Demand Management

Off street parking production



HOW PARKING INCREASES HOUSING COSTS

Limiting density and production of new units.

- The rental vacancy in the Twin Cities has been around 3.5% for many years and increasing housing production and supply is essential for lowering housing costs over time and creating more <u>choice</u> in Saint Paul's housing market.
- Bundling the cost of housing with the cost of parking

BUNDLED

Cost of parking "bundled" into price of other goods and services



- Cost of parking is hidden in goods and services
- Parking appears free, resulting in higher parking demand
- **3** More parking must be funded and built



Cost of parking "unbundled" into price of other goods and services



- Cost of parking is revealed to the user
- 2 Consumers can save money by using less parking, resulting in lower parking demand
- 3 Less parking needs to be funded and built

"BUNDLED" PARKING

Building Parking Raises Rent

Parking costs a lot to build, and that cost usually ends up raising tenant rents.

\$5,000: Cost per surface space

\$25,000: Cost per above-ground garage space

\$35,000: Cost per below-ground garage space

\$142: The typical cost renters pay per month for parking

+17%: Additional cost of a unit's rent attributed to parking

Source: Housing Policy Debate, 2016

WE TYPICALLY DON'T ADJUST MINIMUMS TO REFLECT THE ANNUAL INCOME OF RESIDENTS

According to citywide Census data, an average of **34.3% of families** that need and would qualify for units affordable at 30% of the Area Median Income (AMI) do not own a car.

For lower income residents, the higher cost of housing from **parking minimums are akin to a regressive tax**, if lower income residents pay for parking they don't use as a part of their housing costs.

% of Saint Paul Households with No Car, by Income June 2019



IN SUBSIDIZED DEVELOPMENTS OVER SUPPLY PARKING IS ALSO AN ISSUE.

The public resources that are utilized to create affordable housing are scarce, and if off street parking is **over-supplied** in subsidized affordable housing developments, then a significant portion of Saint Paul's limited housing resources could be used to **construct unused parking instead of housing.**

Project Name	Address	Description	Parcel Size (square feet)	Gross Floor Area (square feet)	Number of Housing Units	Number of Parking Spaces	Aerial
Selby Victoria Apartments	852 Selby Ave	Senior housing, flex units, and commercial	23,928	28,988	24 apartment units, 3 flex units	19	Salay Ano Salay Ano Mark Greffer C C C C
Selby Milton Apartments	940 Selby Ave	Senior housing and commercial	10,301	13,753	10	8	
Ain Dah Yung	769 University Ava	Supportive housing for Native American youth	23 206	51 000	42	12	Almo Gets An Beh Nur Mino Gets An Beh Nur Mino Sets An Beh Nur
Ain Dah Yung	769 University Ave	American youth	23,206	51,000	42	12	and a second sec

30% AMI UNITS/ SUPPORTIVE HOUSING/AFFORDABLE COMMERCIAL SPACE EXAMPLES

Housing for formerly homeless young rossing 1949 University Ave adults 38,986 28,813 44

- 1. The low ratios of parking to residential unit and commercial square feet, and
- 2. The **first floor of these developments is primarily active uses** and not structured parking.

TWO KEYWAYS THESE DEVELOPMENTS ARE DIFFERENT THEN A TYPICAL MARKET RATE DEVELOPMENT

THIS ISN'T A NEW IDEA IN THE SAINT PAUL ZONING CODE

Housing for the elderly - 0.33 space per unit

CHAPTER 65 DEFINITION:

Sec. 65.131. - Housing for the elderly.

A multiple-family structure in which eighty (80) percent of e the occupants shall be sixty-two (62) years of age or over, or a multiple-family structure owned and operated by the <u>city public housing agency</u> (PHA) within which over ninety-five (95) percent of the units have no more than one bedroom and are occupied by persons who are eligible for admission to public housing in accordance with current federal regulations.

INTRO TO THE STUDY AND POLICY CONSIDERATIONS

Climate change and carbon emissions

Housing

Economic Development

Market Value and Tax Revenues

Travel Demand Management

Off street parking production





NEIGHBORHOOD NODES

Policy LU-31 of the Comprehensive Plan calls for investing in Neighborhood Nodes to achieve development that enables people to meet their daily needs within walking distance and improves equitable access to amenities, retail and services.



1 space per 150 sq. ft. GFA

14 Spaces

PARKING POLICY IMPLICATIONS

- By requiring a significant portion of any development site to be used for parking and not active uses, minimum parking requirements detract from walkability of commercial nodes and corridors.
- 2. Achieving this neighborhood node policy objective will require additional commercial density and a greater mix of commercial uses to be developed in many neighborhood nodes.



PARKING POLICY IMPLICATIONS

If this policy is successfully implemented, it will enable more shortterm discretionary trips to be conducted without a car.







Commercial Trade Areas

The proliferation of online shopping

Telecommuting

FACTORS THAT PARKING MINIMUMS DON'T ACCOUNT FOR

INTRO TO THE STUDY AND POLICY CONSIDERATIONS

Climate change and carbon emissions

Housing

Economic Development

Market Value and Tax Revenues

Travel Demand Management

Off street parking production



MARKET VALUE AND TAX VALUE IMPLICATIONS

Policy LU-6 (3) of the 2040 Comprehensive Plan calls for fostering equitable and sustainable economic growth by growing Saint Paul's tax base in order to maintain and expand City services, amenities and infrastructure.



• The market value per parcel square foot is \$679.42

• The tax revenue per square foot is \$12.72

• The market value per parcel square feet is \$49.16

• The tax revenue per square foot is \$1.81



INTRO TO THE STUDY AND POLICY CONSIDERATIONS

Climate change and carbon emissions

Housing

Economic Development

Market Value and Tax Revenues

Travel Demand Management

Off street parking production





THE IMPORTANCE OF TRAVEL DEMAND MANAGEMENT

The term travel demand management (TDM) can be broad and applied differently depending on the audience, and as such, is not universally defined. For instance, an employer may refer to TDM as a Commute Benefits Program, whereas a developer may refer to it as the infrastructural elements of their site design.

However, at its core, TDM is focused on moving people and includes policies and programs that facilitate the reduction and redistribution of travel demand and increase efficiencies in the transportation network, ultimately facilitating a mode shift and reducing the number of drive-alone trips.

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN POLICIES

Reducing or eliminating minimum parking requirements are policy actions that, in themselves, will shift transportation modes over time. This transportation mode shift, however, will likely be gradual and eliminating or reducing minimum parking requirements alone may not be enough to successfully implement Comprehensive Plan policy T-21.

Policy T-21 calls for reducing vehicle miles traveled (VMT) by 40% by 2040 by improving transportation options beyond single-occupant vehicles.

Applying TDM strategies to all new development, in addition to reducing or eliminating minimum parking requirements, would be one of the most effective policy changes that the City of Saint Paul could undertake to reduce carbon output from drive alone trips. Creating a viable TDMP is complicated, expensive, and requires the professional expertise of a traffic engineer or a city planner.

> We don't have clear single occupancy vehicle trip goals so there is a wide variation in the TDMP's submitted and approved by the city.

ISSUES WITH OUR CURRENT ORDINANCE AND PROGRAM

TDMP AMENDMENT SUMMERY

The amendments to the TDM ordinance and the supplemental TDM Program Standards Guide, as proposed with this study, are a unique standardized approach to TDMPs. The intent of the program is to simplify the TDM ordinance, so that a developer could comply without needing the professional expertise of a traffic engineer or planner. Simplifying the program will also result in more predictable outcomes.

		Land Use Group				Dec. and a dec.		Mandaman Davidson				
Cate gory	Strategy	Home-End	Commute Fort I ses	Visit-End	Other	Po	pints	Reductions				
		0.000	Cito C ana									
Land Uses and Physical Amenities												
	Breetsoape											
Physical 1	In provements That	x	x	x		1		496				
	Conditions: Site Access	<u>^</u>	<u> </u>	<u>^</u>								
	Breetsoape											
	In provements That											
Physical 2	In prove Walking	x	x	X		1	•	496				
	Conditions: Traffic											
	Calming New, City-Approved											
Physical 8	Bioyole Path	X	x	X		1	•	496				
Physical 6	Bioyole Repair Station	x	x	x		1	•	496				
	Shovers, Changing											
Physical 8	Facilities, and Lookers		x		x	1	•	4%				
	Active Transmetation											
Physical 7	Fooused Wayfinding					1						
	Some							476				
Physical-8	Car-Share Parking	x	x	x	x	14	••••	16%				
	Real-Time											
Physical 8	Transit/Transportation-	x	x	x	×	1		496				
	Display	<u>^</u>	<u> </u>	<u>^</u>	<u>^</u>			478				
-	Provide Bike Fleet, Bike											
Physical 10	Share	X	x	X		1	•	475				
Physical 11	Delivery-Supportive					1		496				
Burley 14	Amenities On Bilt Downey	^	· ·	^				884				
Physical 14	Transit Improvements	X	X	X		-		496				
Reportant	High and that the improvements		~	~								
- ingrand	Education, Marketing,			_								
H ograms-1	and Outreach	X	X			14		10%6				
R ograms-2	Pree or Subsidized					14		1096				
	Transt Passes Dide Untehing Service		^	^								
R ograms-8	R ovision, Access		x	x		1	•	496				
R ograms-4	Vanpool Program		x	x		2	••	896				
R ograms-6	Carpcol Incertives		x	x		2	••	896				
R ograms-7	Flexible Work Schedules		*	×		15		2096				
Active Me	da Canuin as	_	^	^	_	_						
Active-1	Rike Valet					1		496				
Active 2	DRUYUE MAINERATION			X				104				
Transit	Services	X	X	X				474				
	ShuttleC onrector Bus											
transit-1	Service		X	X		1-0		2496				
Mobility Se	rvices											
M28-1	Car-Share Membership	X	X	X		1	•	496				
M28-2	Other) Service	x	x	x		12	••	896				
M28-3	Delivery Services			x		1	•	496				
Parking Co	ost											
Harking-1	Unbundled Parking	X	X	X		24	••••	1096				
Parking2	Parking Cash Out		x	x		2	••	896				
Han King 8	H be Parking	X	X	X		2		896				

There are currently three voluntary measures in the Saint Paul Zoning Code that would reduce a development's minimum parking requirement: Shared parking; shared vehicle parking; and providing bike parking. The proposed Parking Reduction option increases the number of voluntary reductions in the code from 3 to 28.

PARKING REDUCTIONS OPTIONS

REDUCED MINIMUMS **OPTION** VS FULL ELIMINATION CONSIDERATION

By including this many built-in parking reductions in the code, it is theoretically possible that almost any development, anywhere in the city, could conceivably reduce their minimum parking requirement to zero by taking advantage of enough reductions. A key difference between this approach and Full Elimination of minimum parking requirements, is if minimum parking requirements are being reduced for a development, TDMP measures will simultaneously be implemented which will lower vehicle miles traveled, and therefore overall parking demand.

INTRO TO THE STUDY AND POLICY CONSIDERATIONS

- Climate change and carbon emissions
- Housing
- Economic Development
- Market Value and Tax Revenues
- Travel Demand Management

Off street parking production



PARKING PRODUCTION

Although minimum parking requirements have contributed to the amount of parking that exists in Saint Paul today, **the majority of Saint Paul's parking inventory was built at the discretion of property owners over time and was not required by the City.**

Without reductions, 4,606 spaces would have been required by code and 6,738 parking spaces were built or improved; meaning the market was providing or improving 18% more parking overall than the base minimum parking requirement.

No projects have been built in areas of the city without parking even though projects had the development rights to do so.

Parking Production in Saint Paul



VARIANCE REDUCTION ANALYSIS

Between 2018 and July 2020, there were 32 variances requested to build less parking than mandated by code (i.e. requests to build less than current minimum parking requirements). Full elimination of parking minimums would have eliminated all of these variance requests and the Parking Reduction option would have reduced the number of parking variances by 20 (62%).

THANK YOU!



ParkingStudy@ci.stpaul.mn.us