

# Victoria Schedule C Parking Mandate Adjustments




13 May 2015  
Todd Litman

## Introduction

Many studies indicate that conventional minimum parking requirements significantly increase the cost of developing lower priced housing (Hurd 2014; Manville 2010; Portland 2012). For example, a recent City of Portland study shows that requiring 0.5 to 0.75 off-street spaces per unit increases the costs to occupants by 19-63% compared with no off-street parking, as indicated below.

## Parking Requirement Impacts on Housing Affordability (Portland 2012)

Cost of Onsite Parking + Impacts on Affordability									
Development Prototype		# of Units	# of Parking Spaces	Parking Spaces per Unit	% of Ground Floor used for parking	Parking Cost as a Percentage of Total Construction Cost	Construction Cost	Potential Monthly Rental Range (550 sq ft apartment)*	Monthly Rent Increase as a percentage above No Parking Development Prototype
A	No Parking	50	0	0	0%	0%	4.3 M	\$800 - \$1,150	-
				A building with no parking is able to utilize the full capacity of the development on the site (factoring in assumptions outlined in Methodology). In this scenario fifty units and zero parking spaces are constructed.					
B	Tuck-Under	45	9	0.25	33%	4%	4.3 M	\$850 - \$1,200	6%
				A building with tuck-under parking is able to utilize nearly all development capacity, with a loss of 5 residential units. In this scenario 45 units and 9 parking spaces are constructed. There is a moderate rental rate increase associated with this scenario to accommodate the cost associated with providing tuck-under spaces and loss of potential residential units.					
C	Surface	30	19	0.6	47%	2%	2.8 M	\$1,200 - \$1,800	50%
				A building with surface parking is able to utilize 50 percent of development capacity. In this scenario 30 units and 19 parking spaces are constructed. There is a rental rate increase associated with this scenario to accommodate for the opportunity cost associated with not producing 20 units.					
D	Podium	42	22	0.5	66%	10%	4.3 M	\$950 - \$1,350	19%
				A building with podium parking utilizes 75% of the ground floor to provide parking. In this scenario 42 units and 22 parking spaces are constructed. There are negative impacts to ground floor activity and street frontage which may have a direct impact on surrounding businesses, pedestrians, and street character due to additional curb cuts and loss of continuous storefront/first floor character.					
E	Mechanical	46	23	0.5	40%	22%	5.4 M	\$1,175 - \$1,660	47%
				A building with mechanical parking utilizes 40% of the ground floor to provide parking. In this scenario 46 units and 23 parking spaces are constructed. Mechanical parking is a space-efficient parking alternative as it stacks parking spaces with the aid of mechanical systems. As a result, more parking spaces can be constructed in a smaller space; however, it adds significant cost, at \$45,000 a space.					
F	Underground	44	33	0.75	20%	28%	6.5 M	\$1,300 - \$1,900	63%
				A building with underground parking is challenged given the limitations of the 10,000 sq foot lot. The practicality of producing underground parking is challenged given the short bay width (less than 100') and limitations to circulation between levels. In this scenario 44 units and 33 parking spaces are constructed. The rental increase can be attributed directly to the cost of providing underground parking at a cost of \$55,000 a space.					

 Housing Unit  
 Housing Unit w/ Parking Space  
 Housing Unit Not Built as a result of providing parking

\* Based on Results of Envision Tomorrow Return on Investment Model & Analysis.  
 \* Developments with a Return on Investment of 7 to 10% are reported.

Cost Comparison: Parking Prototype Impacts on Form and Affordability  
Prepared by Bureau of Planning and Sustainability

Other research indicates that lower-priced, infill housing often has parking demands (the number of parking spaces that residents want) far lower than conventional codes require (Arrington and Sloop 2010; Metro Vancouver 2012; Millard-Ball 2015; Schneider, Handy and Shafizadeh 2014). Residents of compact, multimodal neighborhoods typically own half as many vehicles as in sprawled, automobile-dependent areas, and vehicle ownership rates are also much lower than average for lower-income households, and in buildings with parking management strategies such as shared parking, unbundled or priced parking, and carsharing services in or near residential buildings (Litman 2006). Since driveways often eliminate one on-street parking space, off-street parking only provides a net gain if each driveway serves at least two off-street spaces.

As a result, conventional parking requirements are economically inefficient and unfair: they force households to pay for parking spaces that they do not need or want; force lower-income households to subsidize parking facilities used by their more affluent neighbors; and often reduce public on-street parking spaces while providing little net increase in total parking supply.

Reducing parking requirements does not eliminate off-street parking supply, it simply allows developers to decide how much parking to supply based on market demands, and creates incentives to more efficiently manage parking supply, for example, by sharing parking facilities and creating carsharing services that substitute for private vehicle ownership. The City of Victoria has good experience with reduced parking requirements; a decade ago parking requirements were eliminated in the downtown

and Harris Green areas, after which thousands of new housing units have been developed, many relatively affordable units with unbundled parking (parking rented separately from building space).

The City of Victoria currently requires between 0.5 off-street parking spaces per unit for boarding houses and housekeeping units, up to 1.5 spaces per dwelling unit for condominiums. Most new rental apartments or condominiums, including those located near urban villages serving lower-income households, would be required to have 1.0 to 1.4 parking spaces per unit, which is far more than typically required, as indicated by the low vehicle occupancy rates found in many apartment and condominium parking lots.

Below are proposed amendments to Victoria City Zoning Code Schedule C to make these requirements better reflect actual demands.

### Proposed Amendment 1

Eliminate minimum off-street parking requirements for lower-priced housing, defined as housing priced 30% below the median for its category (single-family, townhouses, apartments) located near downtown and urban villages.

### Proposed Amendment 2

Adjust current Schedule C off-street parking requirements based on the following table.

#### Parking Requirement Adjustment Factors

Factor	Description	Minimum Off-street Requirement Adjustments
Facility sharing	Residents share parking lots rather than being assigned individual spaces	Reduce requirements 20%
Priced or unbundled parking	Parking sold or rented separately from building space	Reduce requirements 20%
Density	Number of residents or housing units per acre/hectare	Reduce requirements 1% for each resident per acre (e.g. 15% at 15 residents per acre and 30% at 30 res. per acre)
Land use mix	Range of land uses located within convenient walking distance	Reduce requirements 10% in walkable, mixed-use neighborhoods
Transit accessibility	Nearby transit service frequency and quality	Reduce requirements 10% within 0.4 kilometers of frequent bus service.
Carsharing	Whether a carsharing service is available nearby	Reduce residential requirements 20% if carsharing vehicles are located in or near a residential building
Demographics	Age and physical ability	Reduce requirements 20% for housing for young (under 25) elderly (over 65) or disabled people
Income	Average income of residents or commuters	Reduce requirements 20% if most occupants will be lowest income quintile households

*This table summarizes various factors that can allow parking supply and zoning requirements to be reduced.*

If multiple factors apply, adjustments are multiplicative, since each additional factor applies to a smaller base. For example, if shared parking reduces requirements by 20%, 15 residents per acre reduces requirements 15%, and lower-income residents reduce requirements 10%, the total is calculated as  $1 - [(1-20\%) * (1-15\%) * (1-10\%)] = 39\%$  reduction, not  $1 - (20\% + 15\% + 10\%) = 45\%$  reduction.

To be effective and politically acceptable this may require additional parking management and enforcement. The city can work with neighborhood associations, local businesses and developers to create parking management programs in specific areas that allow and support more sharing of off-street parking, and more effective regulation of municipal on- and off-street parking.

## References

G.B. Arrington and Kimi Iboshi Sloop (2010), "New Transit Cooperative Research Program Research Confirms Transit-Oriented Developments Produce Fewer Auto Trips," *ITE Journal* ([www.ite.org](http://www.ite.org)), Vol. 79, No. 6, June, pp. 26-29; at <http://bit.ly/1L2inL4>.

Eric Jaffe (2015), *The High Cost Of Residential Parking: Every Time A New Building Includes Space For Cars, It Passes Those Costs On To Tenants*, City Lab ([www.citylab.com](http://www.citylab.com)); at [www.citylab.com/cityfixer/2015/05/how-parking-keeps-your-rent-too-damn-high-in-2-charts/392894](http://www.citylab.com/cityfixer/2015/05/how-parking-keeps-your-rent-too-damn-high-in-2-charts/392894).

A-P Hurd (2014), *How Outdated Parking Laws Price Families Out of the City: Bundling Parking With Living Space Structurally Raises The Cost Of Urban Life*, City Lab ([www.citylab.com](http://www.citylab.com)); at <http://bit.ly/1KZZCYq>.

Todd Litman (2006), *Parking Management Best Practices*, Planners Press ([www.planning.org](http://www.planning.org)). Also see, *Parking Management: Comprehensive Implementation Guide*, Victoria Transport Policy Institute ([www.vtpi.org](http://www.vtpi.org)); at [www.vtpi.org/park\\_man\\_comp.pdf](http://www.vtpi.org/park_man_comp.pdf).

Todd Litman (2015), *Affordable-Accessible Housing in a Dynamic City*, Victoria Transport Policy Institute ([www.vtpi.org](http://www.vtpi.org)); at [www.vtpi.org/aff\\_acc\\_hou.pdf](http://www.vtpi.org/aff_acc_hou.pdf).

Michael Manville (2010), *Parking Requirements as a Barrier To Housing Development: Regulation and Reform In Los Angeles*, UCLA Institute of Transportation Studies ([www.its.ucla.edu](http://www.its.ucla.edu)); at <http://bit.ly/1H3RbaH>.

Metro Vancouver (2012), *Metro Vancouver Apartment Parking Study; Revised Technical Report*, Metropolitan Planning, Environment, and Parks ([www.metrovancouver.org](http://www.metrovancouver.org)); at [www.metrovancouver.org/planning/development/strategy/Pages/Implementation.aspx](http://www.metrovancouver.org/planning/development/strategy/Pages/Implementation.aspx).

Adam Millard-Ball (2015), "Phantom Trips: Overestimating the Traffic Impacts of New Development," *Journal of Transportation and Land Use* ([www.itlu.org](http://www.itlu.org)); at <http://bit.ly/1OsKlI4>; summary at <http://bit.ly/1HkHmt1>.

Portland (2012), *Cost of Onsite Parking + Impacts on Affordability*, Portland Bureau of Planning and Sustainability ([www.portlandoregon.gov](http://www.portlandoregon.gov)); at [www.portlandoregon.gov/bps/article/420062](http://www.portlandoregon.gov/bps/article/420062).

Robert J. Schneider, Susan L. Handy and Kevan Shafizadeh (2014), "Trip Generation for Smart Growth Projects," *Access 45*, Fall 2014 (<http://bit.ly/1DHcCiG>); also see the "Smart Growth Trip-Generation Adjustment Tool" (<http://bit.ly/1z2q5Dd>).

Victoria (2005), "Schedule C: Off-street Parking," Zoning Code, City of Victoria ([www.victoria.ca](http://www.victoria.ca)); at <http://bit.ly/1AXwsDj>.