

Summary of the Off-Street Parking and Loading Update

1. Minimum and Maximum Parking in Downtown

Problem: The current regulations do not prescribe a minimum amount of required parking for most commercial development in Downtown. Minimum parking is prescribed for commercial development in the CBD-R (Downtown Residential) Zone and for residential development in all Downtown zones. The prescribed minimum parking requirements represent a “one size fits all” approach when in reality parking demand varies by project. In many cases, minimum requirements result in too much parking.

Existing	Recommendation
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No <u>commercial</u> parking is currently required in downtown except in Residential Zones. Generally, one parking space is required for each parking space per <u>residential</u> unit, which can be decreased to .5 parking spaces per unit with a conditional use permit. .75 parking spaces required per <u>residential</u> unit in the Lake Merritt Station Specific Plan Area, which can be reduced through in-lieu fees. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No parking required for <u>Commercial</u> or <u>Residential</u> activities in the downtown area. Required unbundled parking for new development Transit allowance and transit information required for tenants of developments of 10 units or more.¹ One car share space preserved for buildings between 50 – 200 units, then one car share space per 200 units². Parking maximum of 1.25 spaces per unit

Rationale: *The proposed approach is “project-oriented.” The amount of parking provided would be determined on a project-by-project basis so the amount would be “just right” – not too much, not too little. Downtown is well-served by transit so it can support flexible parking requirements. However, even if there are no minimum parking requirements, developers will likely provide on-site parking if there is market demand.*

¹The transit allowance for each residential unit would be equivalent to ½ the value of an adult AC Transit monthly pass, which is currently \$75 per month. Therefore, the allowance would be \$37.50 per month.

²Car sharing is a type of rental that is designed to be convenient for people who want cars for short periods of times within a day. Car share vehicles are generally stored at convenient locations such as parking lots and on the street.

**Summary of the Off-Street Parking and Loading Update
August 29, 2016**

2. Commercial Parking – Determined by Building

Problem: The current amount of commercial parking required is based on the specific type of business. However, with new commercial development, many times the specific tenant is not known during the design of the project. In many cases, in order to provide the most flexibility for accommodating future tenants, too much parking is provided in the project. If not enough parking is provided, the types of future tenants that could occupy the building is limited thereby making it more difficult to reuse the building.

Existing	Recommendation
<p>No minimum number of spaces generally required in Downtown; <u>Neighborhood Commercial (CN) Zones:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Restaurants – 1 space per 300 square feet of floor area • Retail – 1 space per 600 square feet of floor area • Office – 1 space per 900 square feet of floor area <p><u>Other Zones</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Restaurants – 1 space per 200 square feet of floor area • Retail – 1 space per 400 square feet of floor area • Office – 1 space per 600 square feet of floor area 	<p><u>Downtown Commercial Zones</u> No parking spaces required for Downtown zones (see proposal #1, above)</p> <p><u>All Other Zones</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ground floor commercial space: 1 parking space per 600 square feet of floor area • Upper floor commercial space: 1 parking space per 1,000 square feet of floor area

Rationale: *Under the proposal, new projects with unknown future tenants are less likely to provide too much parking than under the current regulations. The proposal also facilitates the reuse of existing buildings since the parking requirement would not change if a new tenant moves in. Eliminating the restaurant classification would still result in adequate parking supply because the proposed changes would allow shared parking between commercial activities, thereby allowing restaurant patrons to park at lots serving other activities.*

**Summary of the Off-Street Parking and Loading Update
August 29, 2016**

3. Parking Reductions – Multifamily Housing

Problem: The current regulations allow the amount of parking required to be reduced up to 50% with a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) in Downtown and commercial corridors. This provision was added during the citywide zoning update in 2011 as a place-holder until the parking regulations are updated with specific parking reduction standards. The requirement for a CUP discourages the use of this provision and there isn't guidance on how to determine the appropriate size of the parking reduction.

Existing	Recommendation
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Required parking can be reduced by up to fifty percent (50%) in the zones designated on the City's major transportation corridors with the granting of a CUP. 	1) Required parking for a multifamily developments of ten units or more or commercial developments greater than 3,000 square feet may be reduced per the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provision of Car sharing space (onsite)..... 20%³ Provision of Car-sharing spaces (within 600 ft) 10% Transit Allowance provided for each unit⁴ 10% Within ½ mile of a Major Transit Stop.⁵ 30%⁶ 2) Cannot reduce parking requirement by more than 50 percent.

Rationale: Removing the CUP requirement and establishing specific parking reduction standards would encourage projects to incorporate parking demand management strategies. Research shows that the proposed strategies reduce parking demand, and the percentages have been updated to reflect the estimated reductions. The proposal is consistent with The Oakland Energy and Climate Action Plan (ECAP), which contains a policy to establish alternative mechanisms to meeting parking requirements (Policy PA 35).

³ Car share spaces can either be provided only for residents within a new development or for traditional car share organizations. This reduction is based on analysis in the document Car-Sharing: Where and How it Succeeds (2005), page ES-3. The document was developed by the Transit Cooperative Research Program.

⁴ The transit allowance for each residential unit would be equivalent to the ½ the value of an adult AC Transit monthly pass, currently \$75 per month or providing an AC Transit Easy Pass”.

⁵ Major Transit Stop is defined in the California Public Resources Code as site with an existing rail transit station, a ferry terminal served by either a bus or rail transit service, or the intersection of two or more major bus routes with a frequency of service interval of 15 minutes or less during the peak commute periods.

⁶ This reduction was determined through the GreenTrip Database. This database, which was funded by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission and developed by the Oakland branch of [TransForm](#), a transit advocacy group, includes data gathered at multi-family residential sites around the San Francisco Bay Area. Data collection began in November 2013, and is ongoing. The data shows parking supplied, and parking used, at each site.

**Summary of the Off-Street Parking and Loading Update
August 29, 2016**

4. Parking Reductions – Affordable Housing

Problem: New developments that include affordable housing units, whether a mixed income development or a housing project of 100% affordable units, currently trigger the same parking requirements as market rate developments. Yet data shows car ownership and parking demand among affordable housing units is lower than market rate projects. Requiring parking minimums that exceed parking demand leads increased housing costs occupy valuable real estate that could instead be used for additional housing units. Further, State law has recently changed with the passage of AB 744, which does not allow local government to require more than one-half a space per affordable housing unit that is within ½ a mile of a major transit stop.

Existing	Recommendation
<p>Required parking is one space per unit for any affordable housing unit, though developers can apply for a reduction if demonstrating reduced demand.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Required parking is 0.5 spaces per unit for affordable housing unit within ½ mile of a major transit stop consistent with state law. • Required parking is .75 spaces per unit for all other affordable housing units. <p>**These requirements can be reduced through the provision of transit passes and car share spaces as described in proposal #3, above.</p>

Rationale: This new requirement brings the City in line with new state law AB 744 and provides a reduction for all affordable housing because studies show affordable housing produces less of a demand for parking⁷.

⁷ These reductions are consistent with the [San Diego Affordable Housing Study](#), December 2011

**Summary of the Off-Street Parking and Loading Update
August 29, 2016**

5. Parking Reductions – Senior Housing	
<p>Problem: The current regulations allow the amount of parking required for senior housing to be reduced up to 75% with a conditional use permit. This provision acknowledges that reduced parking is appropriate in senior housing. The requirement for a conditional use permit is an unnecessary hurdle and discourages the use of this provision.</p>	
Existing	Recommendation
Required parking can be reduced by 75 percent upon the granting of a Conditional Use Permit.	Required parking may be reduced to 0.25 spaces per unit by right.
<p>Rationale: <i>Removing the conditional use permit requirement would encourage needed senior housing. Senior housing has a lower parking demand than typical residential uses.</i></p>	

**Summary of the Off-Street Parking and Loading Update
August 29, 2016**

6. Unbundling	
<p>Problem: When the cost of including parking is part in the rent or cost of a dwelling unit, it is considered “bundled.” Bundling hides the cost of the parking space and makes the cost of owning a car less expensive relative to other transportation modes. Unbundling requires the building owner to sell or rent parking as separately from a unit, in an attempt to reflect the actual cost of the space. Residents that do not have cars can save money by forgoing parking. Studies have shown that unbundling reduces the number of parking spaces required in a building.</p>	
Existing	Recommendation
<p>Unbundling is required for multifamily residential developments of 10 or more units in the D-BV and D-LM zones only.</p>	<p>Unbundling required for all multifamily residential developments of 10 or more units citywide.</p>
<p>Rationale: <i>Data shows that some tenants do not opt for parking spaces and overall parking demand goes down when unbundling is instituted.</i></p>	

**Summary of the Off-Street Parking and Loading Update
August 29, 2016**

7. Maximum Parking in Transit Oriented Development zones	
<p>Problem: The City has a transit-first policy and has encouraged the creation of Transit Oriented Development, particularly around many of the BART stations within the City. However, lower minimums do not prevent developers from building excessive parking to serve BART users. Excess parking is not consistent with developments oriented toward transit use.</p>	
Existing	Recommendation
No parking maximums exist in any zone.	1.25 parking spaces per unit maximum in the S-15, S-15W, and D-CO-1 zones.
<p>Rationale: <i>This maximum is consistent with the proposal for the CBD and the policies in the Land Use and Transportation Element of the General Plan regarding the character of transit oriented development.</i></p>	

**Summary of the Off-Street Parking and Loading Update
August 29, 2016**

8. Additions to Historic Buildings

Problem: Under the current regulations, minimum parking requirements apply to additions to all buildings, including historic buildings. This discourages the rehabilitation of historic buildings. In many cases, providing new parking for additions is not feasible and requires significant alterations to the historic building, because they often cover an entire site.

Existing	Recommendation
Parking required for additions to historic buildings ⁸ .	No parking required for additions to historic buildings ⁸ when the addition is less than 100% of the floor area of the existing building.

Rationale: *The proposal would encourage the reuse of historic buildings. The size restriction for the addition (less than 100% of the floor area of the existing building) would restrict the parking waiver to smaller projects that are subordinate in size to the existing building.*

⁸ For the purpose of this regulation, historic buildings include Local Register Properties, which are City Landmarks and Districts, properties designated under State and Federal programs, and properties rated “A” or “B” by the City’s Office of Cultural Heritage.

**Summary of the Off-Street Parking and Loading Update
August 29, 2016**

9. Change of Use within Existing Buildings	
Problem: Under the current regulations, minimum parking requirements apply to some change of use of existing buildings. This discourages the reuse and rehabilitation of historic buildings and can limit the flexible use of existing buildings.	
Existing	Recommendation
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parking required for change of use from one activity classification to another for all post-1965 existing buildings. • Parking required for pre-1965 building for a change of use from one “Activity Classification”⁹ to another. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For non-historic properties, no parking required for any changes of use for any building within a “use class” such as Residential, Commercial, Civic, Industrial, or Agricultural and Extractive⁹. • For historic properties¹⁰, no parking required for any changes of use for any building.
Rationale: <i>The proposal will encourage the flexible use of post-1965 constructed buildings. Staff proposes to preserve the parking requirements for changes from one major use category to another in most buildings because often times these conversions have significant parking impacts on a neighborhood. For instance, a conversion of an industrial building to a residential development would significantly increase parking demand in a neighborhood. The proposal will also encourage the rehabilitation and use of Local Register Properties.</i>	

⁹ There are dozens of “Activity Classifications” in the Planning Code, such as Permanent Residential, General Retail Sales, Medical Services, and General Manufacturing. These classifications are organized into five “Use Classes”: Residential, Civic, Commercial, Industrial, and Agricultural and Extractive.

¹⁰ In general, historic buildings include Local Register Properties, which include City Landmarks and Districts, properties designated under State and Federal programs, and properties rated “A” or “B” by the City’s Office of Cultural Heritage. In the Broadway/Valdez and Lake Merritt Station Area Specific Plan Areas, historic buildings are proposed to also include Potentially Designated Historic Properties (PDHPs), which are buildings that have at least a “C” rating or contribute to an historic district.

**Summary of the Off-Street Parking and Loading Update
August 29, 2016**

10. Flexible Use Parking

Problem: In many commercial districts, there is a variety of commercial businesses and customers with parking needs at different times of the day and some businesses have more parking than necessary. These parking spaces could be utilized more efficiently if they could be used by employees and customers located on different lots or by any customer in a commercial district. Under the current regulations, parking required for a business must be reserved for that business; it cannot be shared with another business or used by the public without being considered an auto fee parking lot. Most commercial zones do not permit or only conditionally permit auto fee parking lots.

Existing	Recommendation
Parking must be reserved for the activity it serves unless a permit is granted allowing an auto fee parking lot.	Auto fee parking is permitted for parcels that are: outside of one-half (1/2) a mile from a BART Station, contain an active business, and in a commercial zone.

Rationale: *Allowing commercial businesses to share their parking would result in more efficient use of parking spaces. In a City study of parking in Temescal, shared parking among businesses was identified as a key recommendation to increasing parking supply during peak demand periods. In many cases there are businesses that need nighttime parking, such as restaurants and theaters that are near other businesses with unused parking spaces, such as restaurants and theaters.*

**Summary of the Off-Street Parking and Loading Update
August 29, 2016**

11. Off-Site Parking

Problem: In some cases, providing required parking on the same lot as the activity the parking serves creates visual or site design impacts. In these cases it may be preferable to locate required parking for a new proposal on another lot. Under the current regulations, required parking must be on the same lot as the activity it serves, with the following exceptions: 1) residential activities in neighborhood commercial zones and Downtown; and 2) commercial businesses in all zones. In these cases, all required parking must be located within 300 feet of the lot containing the activity and the lots must have a common owner. Requiring common ownership of the different lots discourages off-site parking and is unnecessary and 300 feet limits the number of potential parking spaces within the district.

Existing	Recommendation
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Off-site parking allowed for residential activities in Neighborhood Commercial and Downtown Zones and commercial businesses in all zones. • The required parking must be located within 300 feet of the primary lot and both lots must be under common ownership. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allow off-site parking for residential activities in all commercial and high density residential zones. • Allow off-site parking for commercial businesses in all zones. • Required parking may be located off-site within 600 feet by right if parking is located on a developed lot; otherwise off-site parking only permitted upon the granting of a conditional use permit. • Common ownership would not be required for off-site parking

Rationale: Removing the common ownership requirement for off-site parking would encourage off-site parking thereby reducing potential visual and site design impacts related to on-site parking. The visual and site design impacts of the off-site parking would be evaluated during the design review associated with the new development. Also, off-site parking located on a lot that does not contain a principal activity would still be classified as Auto Fee Parking which is generally prohibited in residential zones and requires a conditional use permit in commercial zones and Downtown. Staff proposes to require a CUP on undeveloped lots to assure that critical opportunity sites are not required to remain parking.

**Summary of the Off-Street Parking and Loading Update
August 29, 2016**

12. Parking on Small Lots in Commercial Districts

Problem: Incorporating parking into projects on small substandard lots in commercial districts can result in negative visual and site design impacts due to the small lot size. In these cases, parking can visually and physically dominate the site to the detriment of the project and the surrounding district.

Existing	Recommendation
Parking requirements apply to all lots regardless of lot size except in the Broadway Valdez Specific Plan Area.	Parking requirements do not apply to interior lots with less than 40 feet of street frontage in the CN and CC zones.

Rationale: *Eliminating parking requirements on narrow lots would encourage fewer curb cuts and garage doors dominating streetscapes and larger storefront space. Most of the successfully designed commercial districts in the City, such as the Fruitvale and Montclair Districts, have a pattern of small lots without garages or curb cuts interrupting the pedestrian flow and continuous storefront.*

**Summary of the Off-Street Parking and Loading Update
August 29, 2016**

13. Calculating Parking Requirements – Employees vs. Building Size

Problem: For certain activities, the current regulations specify the amount of required parking based on the number of employees. With new development, many times the specific number of employees is not known during the design of the project. Also, defining and identifying the number of “employees” is difficult (due to the variety of work schedules).

Existing	Proposed
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Residential care: 1 space per 3 employees; plus 1 space for each facility vehicle • High schools: 1 space per 3 employees; plus 1 space per 10 students • Other schools: 1 space per 3 employees • Colleges: 1 space per 3 employees; plus 1 space per 6 students • Hospitals: 1 space per 4 beds; plus 1 space per 4 employees; plus 1 space per doctor • Auto sales: 1 space per 1,000 sf or per 3 employees (whichever is less) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Residential care: 1 space per 5 beds • High schools: determined by Director of City Planning based on a parking demand and capacity study. • Other schools: 0.5 space per 1 classroom • Colleges: Determined by Director of City Planning based on a parking demand and capacity study. • Hospitals: Determined by Director of City Planning based on a parking demand and capacity study. • Auto sales: 1 space per 1,000 sf

Rationale: *With new development, many times the specific number of employees is not known during the design of the project. Also, defining and identifying the number of employees is difficult due to the variety of work schedules and predicting future workload. Basing parking requirements for larger projects, such as hospitals, colleges, and schools, on a professional analysis provides a more accurate estimate of parking demand for projects that may have a major parking impact on a neighborhood. Basing parking requirements for auto sales, warehousing, and industrial activities on floor area provides a convenient parking calculation for activities that do not tend to have parking impacts on residential and neighborhood districts.*

**Summary of the Off-Street Parking and Loading Update
August 29, 2016**

14. Parking Required – RM Zones

Problem: The current regulations require one and one-half parking spaces (rounded up) per residential unit in the Mixed Housing Type Residential-1 (RM-1) and RM-2 Zones, although one space per unit is allowed for small lots (less than 4,000 square feet) in the RM-2 Zone. One parking space per unit is required in the RM-3 and RM-4 Zones. The RM Zones are medium-density residential zones found in transit-accessible areas and near major arterials, and are located throughout North Oakland and in pockets of West and East Oakland. These areas are a mix of single-family homes, duplexes, and small apartment buildings. The requirement of one and one-half parking spaces per unit discourages appropriate residential infill development in these neighborhoods.

Existing	Recommendation
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RM-1 Zone: 1.5 spaces per unit • RM-2 Zone: 1.5 spaces per unit • RM-3 Zone: 1 space per unit • RM-4 Zone: 1 space per unit 	<p>One parking space per unit in all the RM zones, except two parking spaces per unit would be required for units with five or more bedrooms.</p>

Rationale: *The requirement of one and one-half parking spaces per unit discourages appropriate residential infill development in neighborhoods that are near transit. Requiring only one parking space per unit also better accommodates the creation of secondary units and increases pervious surfaces on a lot. Finally, having the same parking requirement for each of the RM zones simplifies the Planning Code.*

**Summary of the Off-Street Parking and Loading Update
August 29, 2016**

15. Residential Parking Location – Side/Rear Context

Problem: Under the current regulations, in neighborhoods where parking is located to the side or rear of the residence, new parking for one- and two-unit residential projects is required to be to the side or rear of a residence and set back at least 25 feet from the front lot line. This requirement is intended to preserve the parking character of a neighborhood where existing parking is less visible from the street. Requiring new parking to the side or rear of a residence limits the parking space from detracting from the visual quality of the residence. However, requiring new parking to be at least 25 feet from the front lot line is not consistent with typical parking behavior. Residents with side and rear parking often park near the front lot line to be closer to the entrance of the residence. Requiring paving to the rear of the yard increases impermeable surface area and uses area on a lot that could be used for better purposes.

Existing	Recommendation
New required parking for single family homes and duplexes must be located to the side or rear of a house and at least 25 feet from the front lot line if the site is in a neighborhood with a rear yard parking context.	New required parking for single family homes and duplexes must be located to the side of a lot <u>or</u> rear of a house if the site is in a neighborhood with a rear yard parking context. The parking is <u>not</u> required to be at least 25 feet from front lot line

Rationale: *Unnecessarily requiring paving to the rear of the yard increases impermeable surface area and uses area on a lot that could be used for better purposes.*

**Summary of the Off-Street Parking and Loading Update
August 29, 2016**

16. Driveway Width

Problem: Under the current regulations, the maximum allowed driveway width is 19 feet. It is unclear where the 19-foot maximum applies on the lot. If the regulation applies to the entire lot, limiting the driveway width to 19 feet conflicts the minimum 21-foot back-up space required for maneuvering into and out of perpendicular parking spaces located in the rear of a lot with limited visual impacts to the street.

Existing	Recommendation
Maximum driveway width is 19 feet	Maximum driveway width is 19 feet for front 20 feet of lot

Rationale: *The proposal would limit the visual impacts of parking as seen from the street but allow sufficient driveway width in the remainder of the lot to allow maneuvering into and out of parking spaces.*

**Summary of the Off-Street Parking and Loading Update
August 29, 2016**

18. Aisle Width	
<p>Problem: The regulations previously required a 24-foot maneuvering aisle for parking (i.e., “back-up” space for perpendicularly parked vehicles). During the citywide commercial and residential zoning update in 2011, this standard was reduced to 21 feet to allow more compact residential parking. The 21-foot standard is been adequate for residential parking, where residents are more familiar with the maneuvering dimensions of their parking lot. However, 21 feet does not appear to be adequate for commercial parking where parking turn-over is high and motorists are less familiar with the parking lot.</p>	
Existing	Recommendation
<p>Residential = 21 ft. Commercial = 21 ft.</p>	<p>Residential = 21 ft. Commercial = 23 ft.</p>
<p>Rationale: <i>The proposal would provide adequate maneuvering space based on field tests by City staff and published national standards.</i></p>	

**Summary of the Off-Street Parking and Loading Update
August 29, 2016**

19. Obstructions Next to Parking Spaces

Problem: In cases where the long side of a parking space abuts a wall, fence, post, or similar obstruction, it is difficult to maneuver into and out of the space and difficult for passengers to enter and exit the vehicle due to limited space for opening vehicle doors. The current regulations address this difficulty by requiring the parking space to be two feet wider when the obstruction is on one or both sides of the space and when the space is located perpendicular to the maneuvering aisle. One additional foot is needed to accommodate an opened door on each side. The additional two feet in width is appropriate when obstructions are on both sides of the space. However, two additional feet is not needed when the obstruction is only on one side. In addition, extra width is necessary for vehicle doors in all cases, not just for spaces located perpendicular to the maneuvering aisle.

Existing	Recommendation
Two feet additional perpendicular parking space width required if there is an obstruction on one side or two sides.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• One foot additional parking space width required if there is an obstruction on one side and two feet if there is an obstruction on two sides.• Additional width would apply to all parking spaces.

Rationale: Only one additional foot is needed to accommodate an open door on each side.

**Summary of the Off-Street Parking and Loading Update
August 29, 2016**

20. Loading Berth Requirements

Problem: Transportation and storage technology has significantly improved since 1965, when the current loading requirements were developed. Also, staff has heard from developers that the code requires more residential loading berths than is necessary because building management efficiently schedules move-in times for their residents. Some loading areas are necessary to avoid traffic impacts from trucks parking on the street; however, too many unnecessarily uses valuable and expensive space that could be used for additional dwelling units, landscaping, or other uses. The City has approved several variances to reduce the number of unnecessary loading berths.

Existing	Recommendation
<p><u>Residential:</u> Less than 50,000 sf of development.....No berth required 50,000—149,999 sf of development.....One berth 150,000—299,999 sf of development.....Two berths Each additional 300,000 sf.....One additional berth</p> <p><u>Commercial:</u> See Attachment C</p>	<p><u>Residential:</u> One space required for all developments of 50,000 square feet or more.</p> <p><u>Commercial:</u> A. High loading demand activities (See Attachment C for a list of high loading demand activities) Less than 25,000 sf.No berths required. 25,000 – 59,999 sf.One berth. 60,000 – 159,000 sf.Two berths. Each additional 120,000 sf.One additional berth.</p> <p>B. Low loading demand activities (See Attachment C for a list of low loading demand activities) Less than 40,000 sfNo berths required. 40,000—59,999 sfOne berth. 60,000—159,000 sfTwo berths. Each additional 160,000One additional berth.</p>

Rationale: Staff made these adjustments based on recent experience with development applications and research of other recently updated Planning Codes. These proposals are consistent with other cities, including Seattle, Portland, Berkeley, and San Francisco. However, San Francisco, Berkeley, and San Francisco do not require any loading for residential activities. The proposal includes one loading berth for larger residential developments so residents moving into a building have at least one space to park a moving truck.