



Town of Amherst
Downtown Parking Study

Appendix D

**ACCESS / MOBILITY MANAGEMENT REQUIREMENTS –
SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION**

INTRODUCTION

This appendix contains supplemental information and case studies intended to clarify the possibilities offered by Access Management Requirements (AMRs) as a more flexible substitute for traditional parking requirements. The content provided here is for informational purposes only and does not represent a specific set of strategies for implementation in Amherst. Rather, these examples are intended to serve as touchpoints for the Town of Amherst if AMRs are pursued as a means of encouraging parking and mobility investment in the future. The origin, potential benefits, and potential applications of AMRs are discussed in the following sections.

ACCESS / MOBILITY REDEFINING PARKING REQUIREMENTS

Minimum Parking Requirements

Parking requirements defined within municipal zoning codes are a powerful tool for shaping a town or city's transportation and development character. For several decades, zoning codes across the United States have emphasized minimum requirements for on-site, tenant-reserved parking spaces to protect local street-parking capacities from parking activity generated by new development. The concern was that without these requirements, developers would save money and developable land area by not building any parking, relying instead on nearby street parking to accommodate their project's parking needs. In response, cities began to require sufficient accessory parking at each new development — enough to ensure that a space would always be available for anyone who needed one.

For this to work, not only must developers provide enough parking to meet peak demand, but they need to provide it for free to prevent drivers from parking on-street to save money. The result of this approach is the common practice of requiring far more parking than is consistently needed at new development projects. There are, of course, exceptions, but aerial images of most downtowns and commercial centers attest to the fact that most have been inundated with low-cost parking facilities that are mostly empty, most of the time.

This is not only a waste of some of the best real estate in the country, it depresses development densities and undermines walkable, bike-friendly, and transit-accessible development patterns.

Trend Toward Reduced or Eliminated Requirements

Today, governments are increasingly questioning the merits of minimum parking requirements in urban centers — particularly as traditional urban forms and transportation options have regained considerable market favor. In many of these areas, requirements have been reduced or eliminated in recognition of the potential for minimum requirements to be counter-productive. Increasingly, many are proposing full-scale reviews of their standards, and even considering removing parking requirements altogether.

Minimum parking requirements are not the only reason projects end up “over-parked”. Developers who are unfamiliar with walkable, transit-accessible urban centers often bring

assumptions and formulas built from experience gained in highly auto-dependent environments. As often, lenders bring the same assumptions and formulas to downtown projects, insisting upon levels of parking that go beyond zoning code requirements, and well beyond the highest peak levels of demand generated by realized development.^{1 2} As a result, in many contexts, removing minimum parking requirements is not enough to address the many problems created by a glut of private, free parking in urban areas, as outlined above.

The Emerging-Mobility Disruption

The cost of over-requiring parking is set to become even greater, as disruptive technologies and service innovations, primarily in the arena of “Shared Mobility”, push US travel preferences toward what many expect to be a profound paradigm shift, and potentially a significant drop in personal-auto parking demand. While the exact impact is still to be determined, some experts estimate that self-driving vehicles predominantly utilized through on-demand, shared-mobility services, could eliminate the need for up to 90% of the current parking supply over the next two decades.³ Services like Uber and Lyft are already significantly reducing auto-dependency, allowing more commuters to shift their primary mode away from driving by providing a nimble, affordable, and increasingly-familiar, non-driving “rainy day” commute option.

This relatively recent mobility phenomenon has good company in several, more-established Shared Mobility elements, such as car-share, bike-share, and computer-matched ridesharing. Where access to these options is consistent, one-car and carless households are becoming far more common,⁴ further increasing the share of trips taken by modes that require a fraction of the parking necessary for private autos.⁵ Into this ever-expanding mix of mobility options, driverless autos can be expected to bring a new level of disruption and opportunity. Put simply, driverless ride services will combine the distinctly appealing components of car-sharing (privacy and autonomy) and TNCs (Transportation Network Carriers: door-to-door service, no driving or parking necessary) services at a fraction of the cost for either.⁶

A NEW APPROACH

Require Access Accommodation, Keep Parking in the Mix

Ensure that most parking, whether provide on-site at new development or via In Lieu Fees, provides access benefits that go beyond the development site, and to allow for private and public investments to shift away from parking where and when mobility and Transportation Demand Management (TDM) become more relevant and effective. By keeping parking as a

¹ <http://www.planetizen.com/node/56296>

² <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2009/10/07/AR2009100703996.html>

³ <http://www.motherjones.com/environment/2016/01/future-parking-self-driving-cars>

⁴ <https://escholarship.org/uc/item/5k56406d#page-6>

⁵ <https://www.apta.com/resources/reportsandpublications/Documents/APTA-Shared-Mobility.pdf> (page 6)

⁶ <https://www.morganstanley.com/ideas/car-of-future-is-autonomous-electric-shared-mobility>

primary option, this approach will allow municipalities to focus on parking solutions in the near-term, as downtown parking facilities are redeveloped and replacement capacities remain a priority. Five years from now, the same code will allow municipalities to jointly-develop a mobility hub, or expand a bike-share system should replacement capacities no longer be a necessary part of repurposing downtown parking garages. At the same time, the approach provides a unique range of options for developers to meet requirements that are no longer framed tightly around parking.

Provide on-site parking, which will be credited toward requirements, depending on how it is managed and how broadly accessible the spaces are.

Provide on-site mobility and TDM amenities, which will make non-driving travel to the site more viable and appealing.

Provide funding for district-level investments, which will provide public parking, mobility, and TDM benefits, as befitting context and circumstance at the time.

Parking Requirements become Access Management Requirements

Using the existing framework for calculating minimum parking requirements, the “requirement” is shifted away from parking toward a requirement to manage the project’s access needs and impacts, measured as Access Management Requirement (AMR) points.

Figure 1 Examples of Access Management Requirements (in AMR points)

Land Use	Minimum Requirement
<i>Multi-Family Housing</i>	1 to 3 per dwelling unit, increasing by # of bedrooms
<i>Offices</i>	1 per 200 SQ FT FA - 1 per 400 SQFT FA
<i>Medical Facilities</i>	1 per 4 Planned Bed sites, or 300 SQ FT.
<i>Standard Restaurant</i>	1 per 4 seats, plus 1 per employee on largest shift
<i>Retail Trade</i>	1 per 150 SQ FT FA
<i>Drinking & Entertainment</i>	1 per 4 persons based on building's maximum capacity

Three Options to Satisfy AMR

Developers can meet a project’s AMR through any combination of the following three options.

- On-site parking,
- Bonus TDM measures, and
- In Lieu Fee payments.

Case Study: Aspen, CO

The proposed approach, while novel, is not without precedent. The City of Aspen, Colorado very recently adopted a similar approach for their downtown district (the Aspen Infill Area).

The City of Aspen is preparing for a future into which it is becoming increasingly tenuous to predict rates of parking-demand generation, particularly in walkable, urban centers. It is seeking to integrate parking regulations and TDM into a Mobility Requirement, which will replace all parking requirements in its downtown. To satisfy the Mobility Requirement, developers will have three primary options.

1. Provide on-site parking.
2. Commit to on-site mobility amenities and/or TDM programs, beyond the minimum required for the project's Transportation Impact Analysis.¹
3. Contribute funding to the provision of public parking, mobility, and TDM programs.

This is designed to generate *direct provision of private amenities and programs*, while also allowing developers to, instead *fund the provision of public amenities and programs*. The latter of these options, provided via a Cash in Lieu option, will generate revenue for the City to invest in parking, mobility improvements/expansions, or TDM, according to existing and anticipated needs. This allows the City to respond to changes in parking demand, mobility preferences, and transportation/sustainability objectives by shifting resources toward “right fit” solutions, as those options emerge and evolve.

Case Study: Berkley, California

The City of Berkley, California recently adopted an In-Lieu Fee option for parking requirements, including an increasingly recommended “graduated” fee scale, based on development size and the number of required parking spaces waived. A key advantage of a graduated fee scale is that it makes the fee option particularly affordable for infill projects, while creating an incentive for larger projects to provide on-site parking. This latter incentive can be particularly effective when combined with joint-development opportunities and/or zoning code provisions that encourage shared parking at private developments.

The fee schedule and proposed uses for the collected funds of the program were developed in a workshop with city staff and the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC). After considering a variety of approaches and fee levels the fee schedule was set in the following graduated range:

- \$15,000 per space for spaces 1-5 waived or reduced,
- \$20,000 per space for spaces 6-15 waived or reduced,
- \$25,000 per space for spaces 16-25 waived or reduced, and
- \$30,000 per space for spaces 26 and greater waived or reduced.