

MEMORANDUM

To: Mike Nilsson
From: Bonnie Nelson and Phil Olmstead
Date: October 1, 2010
Subject: Glendale Downtown Specific Plan Parking Recommendations

Introduction

This memorandum represents the result of over a year of work with City staff and stakeholders to develop a comprehensive set of parking reforms for Glendale's Downtown Specific Plan (DSP) area. These reforms are intended to balance the need for the economic vitality of the downtown, the experiences of those who work, shop and live downtown, and the need for mobility to, through, and within downtown for a variety of travelers. The parking reforms center on common sense changes to the existing parking code, combined with a toolkit of incentives to encourage smart growth development in the downtown core.

This memorandum first provides a brief history of the extensive work done on Glendale parking issues in recent years and gives a list of the documents previously sent to the City. Second, this memorandum gives an overview of the goals and rationale behind the proposed recommendations. Finally, this memorandum outlines a number of parking recommendations which are designed to work together to help the City solve its parking inefficiencies related to minimum parking requirements.

Background

In 2006 Nelson\Nygaard Consulting Associates, in collaboration with City staff, completed the City of Glendale *Downtown Mobility Study*. The *Downtown Mobility Study* provided a series of recommendations designed to manage traffic congestion, to encourage the use of alternative modes, and to support the *Downtown Specific Plan* goal of creating a multimodal and pedestrian-oriented downtown district. The recommendations and implementation plan that emerged from the *Downtown Mobility Study* sought to address existing needs and future demand for improved access and circulation within downtown Glendale.

One of the key components of the *Mobility Study* was parking management. An analysis of existing parking conditions in the downtown area revealed that current policies, requirements, and regulations had created a number of parking inefficiencies in the downtown area, such as: localized parking shortages, parking spillover into residential areas, "cruising" for unregulated and free parking, underutilized off-street parking garages, and parking permit programs that did not effectively manage demand for on-street spaces.

In the years since the *Downtown Mobility Plan* was finalized, the City of Glendale has taken steps to implement some of the recommendations from that plan. The first, and most significant, initiative included the implementation of pay station meters on Brand Boulevard and in the surface parking lots serving Brand Boulevard businesses, thereby coordinating the pricing structures for both on-street spaces and off-street garages. The goal of these changes was to increase availability of parking on Brand Boulevard for customers of local businesses, while continuing to allow for free or low cost parking in garages where there was low demand. These actions have been a success, enabling the City to reduce “cruising” in the Brand Boulevard corridor, raise additional revenue, and begin to more efficiently manage its overall parking supply.

At the same time, many of the parking recommendations in the *Downtown Mobility Study* were not immediately implemented, and have since undergone additional study and refinement. Nelson\Nygaard has continued to work with City staff to develop and implement changes to existing parking policies and programs, and has produced a series of memos related to various parking issues.¹ In addition, Nelson\Nygaard has been working with the City to conduct a separate study of parking conditions in the South Brand Boulevard corridor, and recently completed a draft existing conditions analysis. A list of these documents is provided below:

- “Countywide Congestion Mitigation Fee” – June 23, 2008
- “Policy Considerations for TDM Ordinance REVISED” – August 8, 2008
- “In-Lieu Parking Fee” – August 12, 2008
- “DRAFT TDM Ordinance” – August 25, 2008
- “Downtown Transportation Fund” – September 19, 2008
- “Downtown Transportation Fund Planning and Implementation” – January 4, 2010
- “Relationship Between TDM and Parking Demand” – April 2, 2010
- “City of Glendale Parking Requirements – Peer Review” – May 5, 2010
- “City of Glendale – Preferential Parking District Program Peer Review” – May 19, 2010
- “Mixed-Use District Parking Requirements – Best Practices” – August 4, 2010
- “South Brand Boulevard Corridor Parking Study – Draft Existing Conditions Analysis” – August 2010

All of these documents have analyzed a particular aspect of parking in the City of Glendale and have incorporated extensive peer reviews and “best practices” research to develop appropriate recommendations for the City. It is not the intent of this memorandum to revisit the detailed findings from each of these memos and studies, but rather to synthesize their recommendations, particularly as they relate to revisions to the City’s minimum parking requirements. For more detailed information, it is recommended that City staff review each memo or study individually.

Parking Management Goals

Parking requirements impact much more than the number of vehicles that can be stored on a particular site. Parking requirements can determine the viability of a proposed new development, whether an existing building may be reused, how visitors and employees will access and experience downtown, and, ultimately, whether quality development will occur at all. The following specific goals, developed throughout the planning process for Glendale, have served as a guiding framework for these recommendations:

- Utilize parking management best practices as a tool to coordinate the entire parking supply as part of an integrated system.

¹ In relation to minimum parking requirements, the May 5th and August 4th memos are particularly relevant.

- Manage parking facilities with a focus on maintaining availability, not simply increasing supply.
- Optimize investment in parking by making the most efficient use of all public and private parking facilities, before constructing new parking.
- Improve the coordination of Glendale’s on-street and off-street parking policies, so that parking garages are not underutilized, while on-street parking shortages persist.
- Encourage economic revitalization of downtown and remove barriers to development and adaptive reuse projects by adopting parking standards that are tailored to the unique parking demand of mixed use, walkable downtowns.
- Create regulatory certainty for developers as a means to improve economic feasibility and encourage targeted development.
- Improve the quality of life for local residents by reducing congestion, vehicle emissions, and traffic conflicts related to parking inefficiencies.
- Maximize the use of valuable yet scarce street space at all times of the day.

The recommendations included in this memorandum are intended to reinforce these goals and better position the City to achieve its vision for a multimodal and pedestrian-oriented downtown.

Recommended Revisions to Parking Requirements

The recommendations included below are designed to work together to meet Glendale’s parking management goals. While these recommendations could theoretically be implemented piece by piece, their effectiveness can only be ensured if they are implemented together. The recommendations are based on sensible adjustments to the City’s parking requirements, supplemented by a menu of options that can further adjust parking requirements based on proven performance standards.

1. Avoid a complete overall of the minimum parking requirements, but implement targeted reductions within the DSP zone.

Previous analysis has shown that the minimum parking requirements for the land uses outlined below are artificially high, compared with local and best practice peers, and verified by actual demand in the City of Glendale. Adjusting these requirements will keep Glendale in line with peer cities making it an attractive city for new smart growth development. Recommendations are for the DSP area, where mixed use and higher density development is likely to occur, multimodal access options are available, and demand management techniques are likely to have the greatest impact. Figure 1 provides a summary of the proposed recommendations for selected land uses, as well as a sample of the minimums from peer and best practice cities which helped to inform the recommendations.

It should be noted that the proposed standards represent minimum parking requirements, not the precise number of parking spaces that will be built. A developer may choose to provide additional parking, based on an analysis of market demand. Minimum standards simply provide the “floor” for parking spaces, and cannot be reduced unless by employing the specific measures that are described below.

Figure 1. Proposed Reductions in Parking Minimums for Selected Land Uses

Land Use	Existing Standard	Proposed Standard	Peer/Best Practice City Standards
Multifamily in DSP			
1 bedroom	1.25 spaces	1 space	Culver City: 1 space; Petaluma: 1 space
2+ bedrooms	2 spaces	2 spaces	Long Beach: 2 spaces; Pasadena: 2 spaces
Guest parking	.25 spaces per unit (w/ more than 4 units)	None or 1 per 10 units	Pasadena: 1 per 10 units; Denver: none
Retail	4 per 1,000 sq. ft.	3 per 1,000 sq. ft.	Pasadena: 3 per 1,000 sq. ft.; Culver City: 2.86 per 1,000 sq. ft.; W. Hollywood: 3.5 per 1,000 sq. ft.
Office	2.7 per 1,000 sq. ft.	2 per 1,000 sq. ft.	Denver: 2 per 1,000 sq. ft.; Sacramento: 1.7 per 1,000 sq. ft.; Hercules: 2 per 1,000 sq. ft.; Downtown Ventura: 2 per 1,000 sq. ft.
Medical/Dental Offices	5 per 1,000 sq. ft.	4 per 1,000 sq. ft.	Pasadena: 4 per 1,000 sq. ft.; Culver City: 2.86 per 1,000 sq. ft.
Bars/Taverns	10 per 1,000 sq. ft.	5 per 1,000 sq. ft.	Culver City, Pasadena, San Diego: 5 per 1,000 sq. ft.; Long Beach: 4 per 1,000 sq. ft.; Sacramento: 3.3 per 1,000 sq. ft.
Nightclubs	28.6 per 1,000 sq. ft. or 1 per each 5 fixed seats	20 per 1,000 sq. ft.	Sacramento: 10 per 1,000 sq. ft.; San Jose: 25 per 1,000 sq. ft.
Fast food restaurants	12.5 per 1,000 sq. ft.	5 per 1,000 sq. ft.	Denver: 5 per 1,000 sq. ft.; Long Beach: 5 per 1,000 sq. ft. plus 1 per 3 seats; Petaluma: 3.3 per 1,000 sq. ft.
Restaurants	10 per 1,000 sq. ft.	5 per 1,000 sq. ft.	Denver: 5 per 1,000 sq. ft.; San Diego: 2.5 per 1,000 sq. ft.

2. Amend change of use regulations to allow for parking exemptions for commercial spaces smaller than 5,000 square feet.

According to the Glendale zoning code, if a building expansion creates an increase in floor area or additional seats then additional parking must be provided to meet the minimum parking requirements. Change of use and reuse regulations are particularly pertinent to Brand Boulevard and other streets near downtown Glendale, where small commercial spaces turn over frequently and a number of vacancies present opportunity sites for new development. However, with limited options for on-site parking, it is difficult to encourage developers to locate to Glendale’s “Main Street” because it is challenging or impossible to provide the required parking. Developers at these sites almost always request exemptions from parking requirements, which are fully discretionary and can create uncertainty for developers. The current parking code, however, does provide some major exceptions to the change of use and reuse regulations, including:

- Additions of floor area up to 25 percent of a designated historic resource on the Glendale Register of Historic Resources shall be exempt.
- Any change of use permitted in a historic resource shall not be required to provide additional parking to that legally required prior to the change of use.
- Changes in use of commercial spaces under 2,000 square feet are not required to add more parking.

It is recommended that the City amend change of use exceptions to state that changes in use of commercial spaces under 5,000 square feet are not required to add additional parking. Such revisions will help to encourage redevelopment of smaller commercial establishments by lowering the parking burden on developers.

3. Provide a robust menu of options to *meet* parking requirements.

While minimum parking standards are only recommended to be adjusted in targeted ways, the recommendations include increasing the opportunity for developers to comply with minimum parking requirements through “state of the practice” parking management techniques. These techniques do not reduce parking minimums themselves, but provide a toolkit that allows a developer to meet their requirement in the most efficient way possible. By providing developers with the option and flexibility to meet parking standards, the City can promote an environment that is both friendly to development and supportive of multimodal and sustainable growth. Outlined below are the key alternative methods. It should be noted that none of these alternatives would be required – a developer would consider the cost of building to the minimums (or above), the market advantages for doing so, and would balance those considerations against the opportunity offered by any one or a combination of the techniques outlined below.

3.1 – Eliminate requirement that all parking be independently accessible and allow for tandem and/or stacked parking as of right.

Glendale’s minimum parking requirements, coupled with the current code requirement that all parking be independently accessible, means that often more than one square foot of parking area is required for every square foot of building. These requirements add significant additional expense to development – especially when parking is provided underground – and can act as a barrier to new development and adaptive reuse projects necessary to add vitality to downtown Glendale. In addition, when site conditions or financial constraints prompt developers to provide the required independently available parking on-site, the result is often monolithic parking podiums that present a “blank wall” to the pedestrian realm.

Tandem and/or stacked parking is an effective tool for reducing the need to construct additional off-street spaces and enabling more efficient use of existing facilities. The City of Glendale currently allows for tandem parking, but its regulations are strictly limited to parking spaces only “in excess of minimum requirements.” The Glendale parking code is silent on stacked parking.

Glendale should eliminate its requirement that all parking be independently accessible and revise its tandem parking requirements to allow for greater flexibility and more widespread use of this parking management tool. A number of specific parameters for tandem and stacked parking are recommended:

- Tandem and/or stacked spaces are permitted to count against parking minimums, as is the case in many other cities. For example, a single tandem or stacked parking space would count as two spaces, not one.
- For residential uses: 100 percent of off-street spaces required in residential uses should be allowed to incorporate tandem and/or stacked parking, under the condition that any given set of tandem/stacked spaces shall be assigned to the same unit.
- For non-residential uses: 50 percent of off-street spaces required in non-residential uses should be allowed to incorporate tandem and/or stacked parking, under the condition that valet parking is also provided.
- Tandem spaces shall have a recommended minimum size of 8.5 feet by 36 feet.

3.2 – Allow for shared parking as of right.

Shared parking works best when uses with different peak demand periods share spaces, thereby reducing the number of spaces needed to meet the combined peak parking demands. Shared parking also has the benefit of encouraging drivers to park once and visit multiple

sites on foot rather than driving to and parking at each site. This reduces vehicle traffic and increases foot traffic, creating a safer pedestrian environment. The City's existing zoning code allows parking to be shared among different uses but requires additional approvals, permits and public hearings to receive permission to share parking among compatible uses. In order to make the process of securing approval for shared parking less onerous for new downtown development and adaptive reuse projects, the City should:

- Allow parking to be shared among different uses within a single mixed use building as of right upon staff approval.
- Allow parking to be shared among different buildings and uses at an off-site facility by right upon staff approval, provided that the two uses are within a 1,000 foot walking distance of each other. Shared parking in excess of 1,000 feet walking distance between parking facility and destination may be allowed with approval by staff when accompanied by a detailed parking management plan showing how the shared facility will meet occupant's needs and that a reasonable provision has been made to allow off-site parkers to access the principal use (e.g. shuttle bus, valet parking, free Beeline transit passes, etc.).
- Shared on-site or off-site parking should be allowed to satisfy 100 percent of the minimum parking requirement for each use, so long as documentation can be provided that the existing or anticipated land use(s) will have different periods of peak parking demand, that the shared parking can accommodate the parking demand for both uses.
- When public parking is leased as shared and/or off-site parking for private development and adaptive reuse projects, the City should charge market rates. The City should monitor occupancy rates for individual facilities and increase parking rates when occupancy exceeds 85 percent.

3.3 – Implement an in-lieu parking fee within the DSP area.

An in-lieu parking fee gives developers the option to pay a fee “in-lieu” of providing some portion of the number of parking spaces ordinarily required by the city's zoning ordinance. In-lieu fees provide flexibility for developers and enables projects (especially adaptive/historic reuse projects) that would have once been financially infeasible to move forward. The fees collected can also be used to build public parking spaces, manage parking supply, and/or to support mobility strategies in the downtown area.

As part of the *Downtown Mobility Plan* and its August 2008 memo on in-lieu fees, Nelson\Nygaard provided a detailed analysis of in-lieu fees, the high cost of providing parking in Glendale, a peer review of other in-lieu fee programs, and a tailored methodology for determining a new in-lieu fee in the DSP. The key recommendations from those documents remain relevant. They include:

- A combination of fee types (one-time and annual) is recommended. It is recommended that new developments are charged a *one-time* fee in order to avoid revenue collection issues which can occur when a property changes owners. In addition, a one-time fee would allow developers to more easily incorporate the fee into financial analyses and can decide early in the development or redevelopment process whether to provide the parking or pay the fee. By contrast, change of land uses should pay an *annual* fee. This option provides more flexibility, particularly since changing land uses poses more of a financial risk, such as when a retail establishment becomes a restaurant with no guarantee of financial success.
- The in-lieu fee ordinance should clearly state that once the annual in-lieu fee has been established, the fee remains with the land use rather than the property owner.

- The recommended *one-time* fee is \$24,000 per space. The recommended *annual* fee is \$600 per space per year.
- Fees should be adjusted every year according to the Consumer Price Index (CPI).
- Change of use projects should be allowed to use the in-lieu fee to forgo any portion up to 100 percent of required parking, however new developments are limited to using the in-lieu fee to no more than 50 percent of their adjusted parking demand.

4. Provide additional methods, or a “toolbox,” to further *reduce* parking requirements by implementing proven techniques that decrease parking demand.

In addition to providing alternatives for new development to *meet* parking requirements, it is also recommended that the City provide a number of options to *reduce* the overall amount of required parking by implementing and monitoring programs that are proven to reduce overall parking demand. By reducing the amount of required parking, the “toolbox” outlined below will provide developers with additional design flexibility and further enhance the financial feasibility of new projects. Furthermore, such methods can be used to leverage existing City investments in transit and other strategies to reduce driving while promoting sustainable growth.

4.1 – Proximity to transit.

In an effort to encourage the use of alternatives to driving, reduce dependence on vehicles, and leverage existing investments in transit, many cities grant parking reductions for projects located close to major transit facilities. These reductions typically come in one of two forms: an “across the board” reduction regardless of land use; or reductions tailored specifically to the proposed land use. It is recommended that the City of Glendale offer the latter method as a way to further reduce parking requirements. The following parameters are recommended:

- Projects eligible for parking reductions would include all new development, regardless of land use, within 1/4th mile of a “major transit facility”. A “major transit facility” is defined as: a bus stop that serves both local and regional transit with a net 15-minute peak-hour headway. Based on the current network of local (Beeline) and regional (Metro Rapid and Metro Local/Limited) bus routes serving the DSP zone, the streets that currently have a major transit facility in the DSP zone are Brand Avenue, Central Avenue, Broadway, and Colorado Street.
- Given the relatively low transit mode share in Glendale, it is recommended that the City take a slightly less aggressive approach than what other best practice cities have done. For example, the City of Denver grants up to a 25 percent reduction for any land use within 1/4th of a mile of a transit station. Given the relatively low transit mode share in Glendale, it is recommended that the City take a slightly less aggressive approach than what other best practice cities have done. More specifically, the City should implement a two-tier reduction program.
 - Tier 1: 10 percent parking reduction for all new development within 1/8th of a mile of major transit facility regardless of land use.
 - Tier 2: 5 percent parking reduction for all new development within 1/4th of a mile of major transit facility regardless of land use.

4.2 – Transportation Demand Management (TDM) programs

As detailed in Nelson\Nygaard’s April 2010 memorandum, transportation demand management (TDM) programs have proven to be very successful in reducing the need for drive-alone commute trips, and thereby the demand for parking. TDM programs work by providing incentives to use alternative modes. The most effective TDM programs include some form of financial incentive, either through pricing parking or subsidizing transit and other alternative modes. This can be done through a parking cash out program or other program where employees are given a choice about how to spend transportation dollars. The City currently has a TDM ordinance (see Chapter 30.32.170 of the Glendale Municipal Code), which applies to only non-residential development and only requires limited TDM measures, such as informational and promotional materials, vanpool/carpool parking, and limited bicycle parking. The recommendations included below are designed to tie the commitment to transportation demand management to the reduction in parking requirements.

Figure 2 below provides a menu of TDM measures organized into six general categories. Some of these measures are more applicable to retail/commercial developments, others would work best with residential projects, and some are applicable to all types of land uses. While it is not an exhaustive list, it does include the most common TDM measures. Additional programs could be included if found to be applicable to the DSP zone. A relative “score” has been given to each TDM measure based on its proven ability to reduce drive-alone rates and demand for parking. For example, research has shown that financial incentives, such as pricing of parking, parking cash out, and subsidized transit, are the most effective ways to reduce drive alone commutes.² As such, these financial incentives would be assigned a higher point total than, for example, marketing services, an effective, yet less robust TDM measure. Research has also shown that a “well-balanced” TDM program that offers a variety of measures which support each other (e.g. a subsidized transit pass program in addition to a Guaranteed-Ride-Home program) will be more effective than a TDM program built around a single trip reduction measure. Therefore, to obtain more significant parking reductions a new development would have to demonstrate a TDM program that utilizes a variety of trip reduction measures.

Under this recommendation, developers could establish a TDM program for their development using the menu provided in Figure 2, and after submitting their TDM plan to the City, could be granted a reduction in parking requirement based on how comprehensive and robust a program they offer. Depending on the total point value of the TDM program, each development would qualify for a reduction from the minimum parking requirements. It is recommended that Glendale provide a “tiered” range of percent reductions as away to incentivize robust and diverse TDM programs, as well as specific TDM measures that are known to be particularly effective. As outlined in Figure 3, the proposed range of parking reductions includes three tiers. For example, in order to obtain a 20 percent parking reduction, a TDM program must generate a minimum of 10 points from at least three different TDM categories. The highest reduction, 30 percent, would require at least 15 points from four different categories, one of which must be a parking or financial incentive measure.

² See April 2, 2010 TDM memo for detailed findings.

Figure 2. Potential TDM measures and proposed point values

Potential TDM Measures Eligible for Parking Reductions	Summary of TDM Measure	Proposed Point Values
Parking		
Pricing parking	Pricing parking for commuters.	6
Financial Incentives		
Subsidized Transit	Provide free or highly reduced transit passes.	5
Parking Cash-out	Employees who do not drive to work are offered a cash value equal to parking subsidies.	5
Commuter benefit programs	Use tax-free dollars to pay for commuting expenses.	4
Free HOV/Carpool Parking	Free parking for HOV or carpools.	1
Automobile Trip Consolidation		
Carpool/Vanpool Programs	Shared use of private vehicle or rented/purchased vans.	2
Rideshare Matching Services	Help commuters find travel partners and share costs.	3
Guaranteed Ride Home	Provide occasional subsidized rides to commuters to help deal with unexpected conditions.	3
Shuttle services	Shuttle service to/from location and public transit facilities.	4
Scheduling		
Telecommute	Use of telecommunications to substitute for physical travel.	2
Flextime	Employees are allowed some flexibility in their daily work schedules.	2
Compressed work week	Employees work fewer but longer days.	1
Staggered shifts	Shifts are staggered to reduce the number of employees arriving and leaving at one time.	1
Promotion		
Marketing/Outreach	Determining consumer needs/preferences, creating appropriate products, and promoting use.	1
Travel Training	Provide individualized training/materials on transit, ridesharing, car sharing, and bicycle systems.	2
Transportation Coordinator	Professionals who implement and monitor TDM programs.	3
Multi-modal Infrastructure		
Car sharing	Provide access and/or reduced fees for car sharing facilities.	4
Bike sharing	Provide access and/or reduced fees for bike sharing facilities.	3
On-site amenities	Includes showers/lockers, secure bicycle parking, child care services, etc.	2

Figure 3. Proposed range of parking reductions and point thresholds

	% Reduction	Point Thresholds	Annual Monitoring	TMA Membership
Tier 1	10% reduction	6-9	Required	Required
Tier 2	20% reduction	10-14 (from 3 categories)	Required	Required
Tier 3	30% reduction	15+ (from 4 categories, including at least 1 parking or financial incentive)	Required	Required

Finally, it is recommended that each development wishing to obtain a parking reduction by implementing a TDM program should also be subject to a number of additional requirements to ensure the effectiveness of the TDM program. These conditions include:

- Annual Reporting:** TDM programs are only as effective as their ongoing management. As a result, it is recommended that the City of Glendale require that each development monitor its TDM program annually to not only ensure compliance among businesses and tenants, but also document effectiveness. The City should require that each development conduct an annual survey of its TDM programs and participants. This survey information would then be used to produce an annual citywide report which would document the mode share shifts and TDM participation.

The Lloyd District TMA in Portland, Oregon provides an excellent example of an annual effort made to evaluate and quantify the effects of TDM programs.³

- **TMA Membership:** Each development granted a parking reduction via a TDM program should also be required to join a Transportation Management Association (TMA). Mandatory membership would increase the effectiveness of TMAs and generate additional revenue for citywide mobility programs. This requirement would be designed to complement Recommendation #5.
- **Leasing Requirement:** Any development that obtains a parking reduction via a TDM program would need to include in the tenant lease a requirement for mandatory implementation of the approved TDM measures. This requirement would help to ensure that approved TDM measures are being implemented by all tenants of any new development, and that their parking reductions are justified. This requirement would run with the lease and not with the tenant. For residential projects, the TDM measures would be a part of the HOA agreement and could not be changed without penalty to the City.

5. Require all new development, of a certain size located within the DSP, to become members of a Glendale TMA.

In addition to requiring TMA membership for any new development with a TDM program, the City should also require all new development, of a certain size, to become dues paying members of a TMA. This would yield a significant revenue stream from new development to be spent on programs to improve transportation, both for that new development and for all employees, residents, and visitors to within Glendale's downtown specific plan area. The City should require that new commercial properties of at least 30,000 square feet join the TMA serving their location. Additionally, all new residential development, with 8 or more units in a single development, should also be required to join a TMA. Finally, this requirement would apply not the tenant but to the development itself. This particular recommendation is discussed in greater detail in the August 8, 2008 memo.

6. Eliminate or reduce the need for discretionary administrative exceptions by allowing all recommended parking alternatives and reductions as of right.

The City of Glendale currently offers two methods by which a reduction in parking requirements can be obtained. First, owners or developers can apply for an administrative exception to the parking code, which are limited in scope (three spaces or 5 percent, whichever is greater). Second, there is a discretionary process by which the City Council can reduce parking requirements under certain conditions – mixed use projects, new construction near existing parking, adjacent to transit, projects in redevelopment areas, and disabilities upgrade. Currently, many developers request exceptions for their projects through one of these two methods, and are usually granted such an exception by City Council.

Unfortunately, this process has a number of significant drawbacks. First, it creates a large administrative burden on the City, as both staff and Council must process and evaluate each request individually. Second, the City essentially gives the reduction away for “free” and gets little in return, other than the desired development. Many of these exceptions rely on publicly available parking to meet their parking demand, and as public parking spaces are a limited (though currently very plentiful) commodity, the City must be able to weigh requests carefully. Finally, the discretionary process for granting reductions ultimately undermines the

³ Lloyd District TMA – [Annual Report 2010](#).

effectiveness of any larger parking management strategy. Parking policies exist to guide overall management of the City's supply and demand of parking, yet consistent exceptions to these policies create "loopholes" that make efficient parking management even more challenging.

Therefore, it is recommended that the City dramatically reduce the use of administrative exceptions and discretionary review of parking requirements. By implementing the revisions to the parking minimums and providing a well-defined menu of reduction strategies, there should no longer be a need for a developer to go to City Council for an exception. The recommendations provided in this memorandum offer a clear and defined path by which new developments can meet or reduce their parking requirements. Furthermore, the City can reduce its administrative burden and ensure that parking reductions are consistent with, and supportive of, larger parking management goals. For example, providing the option of paying an in-lieu parking fee to satisfy some portion of a property's parking requirements would reduce the number of parking requirement reduction requests made, thus reducing administrative work involved in this process, and would also raise money for the City to spend on additional transportation projects or mobility programs. Parking exceptions would still be possible, but should be considered favorably by Council only after all other available remedies have been exhausted.

7. Adopt a bicycle parking ordinance

In recent years many cities have adopted bicycle parking requirements for new development. These ordinances are designed to encourage the use of non-motorized travel modes, ensure that bicyclists have adequate infrastructure, and reduce the need for vehicle parking. The City of Glendale currently has limited requirements for bicycle parking in nonresidential developments (see Chapter 30.32.170 of Glendale Municipal Code). It is recommended that the City create a more comprehensive ordinance that applies to all land uses within the DSP. It should be noted that while bicycle parking is available as a potential TDM reduction measure, a statutory bicycle parking ordinance is preferred, as it would formalize the provision of bicycle parking, a crucial piece of non-motorized infrastructure, in all new City developments.

Bicycle parking ordinances are similar to existing parking requirements in that they set general provisions for applicability, detail facility design standards, and detail the minimum number of bicycle parking spaces by land use. For example, 1 space for every 20 dwelling units in a multi-family residential project or 1 space for every 10,000 square feet of office space.⁴ These minimum requirements would be tailored to respond to the demand and need for bicycle parking in downtown Glendale.

Numerous cities have also leveraged their bicycle parking ordinances to offer vehicle parking reductions for bicycle parking that is supplied beyond the minimum. It is recommended that the City of Glendale adopt a similar provision in any new bicycle parking ordinance. The City should allow bicycle parking to substitute for up to 10 percent of required parking. Such a provision would reflect policies in best practice cities, such as Portland, which allows bicycle parking to substitute for up to 25 percent of required parking, but be more consistent with local conditions in Glendale. Like in Portland, existing parking spaces in Glendale should also be allowed to be converted to take advantage of this provision. For example, for every five *non-required* bicycle parking spaces that provide short (standard bicycle racks) or long-term (secure bicycle parking, such as a bicycle locker) bicycle parking, the motor vehicle parking requirement is reduced by one space.

⁴ See example: City of Oakland – [Bicycle Parking Ordinance](#)

Summary of Parking Recommendations

The recommendations outlined in this memorandum will not solve all of Glendale’s parking inefficiencies, but they are carefully designed to enable the City to address its most pressing parking challenges in a pragmatic and readily achievable manner. It is also important to note that all of the recommendations outlined in this memorandum are “additive.” In other words, these recommendations have been created to purposefully allow new developments to achieve significant reductions in parking. Figure 4 provides a simplified illustration of how these recommendations could coalesce to offer a maximum parking reduction for a 100-unit multifamily residential project in the DSP zone, as well as the innovative methods a developer could utilize to meet its parking requirement.

Figure 4. Illustration of Parking Reductions with Proposed Recommendations

Proposed Project: 100-unit (50 1 bdrm, 50 2+ bdrm) multifamily residential project; Located in DSP zone; 1/8th of a mile from transit		
	Existing Requirement	With Proposed Recommendations
50 1 bedroom units	62.5	50
50 2+ bedroom units	100	100
Guest Parking	25	0
Baseline Requirement	187.5	150
Potential Reductions Using Proposed "Reduction Toolbox"		
1/8 of a mile to major transit facility (-10%)	n/a	15 space reduction
15-point TDM program (-30%)	n/a	45 space reduction
Bicycle parking beyond minimum (-10%)	n/a	15 space reduction
Baseline Requirement w/ Maximum Reductions	n/a	75
Additional Methods to Meet Baseline Requirement		
Use of tandem/stacked	n/a	Up to 100%
Use of shared parking, if applicable	n/a	Up to 100%
Use of an in-lieu fee	n/a	Up to 50%

Under the current code, this example development would need to provide a baseline of 187.5 parking spaces. However, under the proposed revisions to the parking code, that baseline would be reduced to 150 spaces. Utilizing the new “toolbox,” a developer could achieve further reductions. In this example, the developer has agreed to create an aggressive TDM and bicycle parking program, plus take advantage of proximity to a major transit corridor. This combination of toolbox reductions would reduce the minimum parking requirement to 75 spaces. This is not to suggest that any developer would build a 100 unit building with only 75 spaces, but that the required minimum would drop to this level, and then allow the developer to determine the number of spaces needed for a saleable development.

Once the developer determines the number of spaces to be provided, he could meet the requirement entirely on site, through shared or off-site parking and or by paying an in-lieu fee. The maximum potential for those methods are also shown on Figure 4. While these recommendations represent a significant change to the way parking is managed in Glendale, they are not designed to let developers avoid their parking responsibilities, but rather to push them to concretely demonstrate a strong commitment to smart growth planning and progressive parking and trip reduction policies. Ultimately, the reforms will give developers the additional flexibility they need to meet parking requirements in a manner that supports the City of Glendale’s vision for a walkable, sustainable, and multimodal downtown.

Figure 5. Summary of Parking Recommendations

Recommendation	Key Elements	Potential Impacts
1. Targeted reductions to minimum requirements.	Lower parking minimums for key land uses in DSP: multifamily residential, office, retail, etc.	Reduced parking burden; Improved project feasibility
2. Amend change of use exceptions.	Allow for parking exceptions for commercial spaces smaller than 5,000 square feet.	Improved project feasibility
3. Provide a menu of alternatives to meet parking requirements.	1. Allow tandem/stacked to count towards minimum.	Residential: 100% of minimum (same unit) Non-residential: 50% of minimum (w/ valet services)
	2. Allow shared parking among uses in a mixed-use building.	
	Allow shared parking among different uses or an off-site parking facility by right upon staff approval, provided that the two uses are within the DSP boundaries and within a 1,000 foot walking shed of each other.	100% of minimum
	3. In-lieu fees: Combination of fee types	Change of use: 100% of minimum New development: 50% of minimum
	Fee remains with land use, not property owner	
	\$24,000 per space (one-time)	
\$600 per space (annual)		
Adjusted annually		
4. Provide additional methods to further reduce parking requirements.	1. Proximity to transit.	1/4 mile: 5% reduction 1/8 mile: 10% reduction
	2. Implement a "point-based" TDM program.	Tier I: 10% reduction
	3 "tiers" of parking reduction.	Tier II: 20% reduction
	Required annual reporting and TMA membership.	Tier III: 30% reduction
TDM leasing requirement.		
5. Require mandatory TMA membership	Require all new development in DSP (commercial development great than 30,000 sq. ft residential developments with 8 or more units) to join the Glendale TMA.	Additional revenue for mobility programs.
6. Allow for parking alternatives and reductions as of right	Reduce the need for administrative exceptions by providing a well-defined path for meeting and/or reducing minimum requirements.	Reduced administrative burden; Additional revenue; Consistent regulatory framework
7. Adopt a bicycle parking ordinance.	Require all new development in DSP to provide bicycle parking. Allow additional vehicle parking reductions for bicycle parking built in excess of minimum standards.	Formalize bicycle parking as a key mobility strategy. Up to 10% reduction.