

**PUBLIC REVIEW DRAFT OF OFF-STREET PARKING PROPOSAL
CITY OF OAKLAND PLANNING DEPARTMENT
OCTOBER 2015**

1. Downtown Parking Minimums

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 for 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 parking¹ for new development Transit Passes and transit information required for tenants.

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. There are successful projects in Downtown involving the conversion of commercial buildings to residential live/work units with no parking required or provided. However, even if there are no minimum parking requirements, developers will likely provide on-site parking if there is market demand.*

¹ Parking is often “bundled” with building costs, which means that a certain number of spaces are automatically included with the rental or purchase of a residential unit. “Unbundled Parking” is parking that is sold or rented separately from a unit. For example, rather than renting an apartment for \$2,500 per month with a parking space at no extra cost, each apartment may be rented for \$2,250 per month. Another \$250 per month may be charged, but only if a tenant chooses to rent a parking space. This technique reduces the number of parking spaces required for residents, particularly in transit and car share rich areas such as Downtown, and makes residential units more affordable.

**Off-Street Parking Update
Public Review Draft of Parking Proposal
October 2015**

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;</p> <p><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. Activities with the potential to result in neighborhood impacts, including parking impacts, typically require a conditional use permit which provides an opportunity to assess the appropriateness of the proposed parking. 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.*

**Off-Street Parking Update
Public Review Draft of Parking Proposal
October 2015**

3. Parking Reductions – Commercial Corridors and High-Density Residential Zones

Problem: The current regulations allow the amount of parking required to be reduced up to 50% with a conditional use permit in Downtown and commercial corridors. This provision was added during the citywide commercial and residential zoning update in 2011 as a place-holder until the parking regulations are updated with specific parking reduction standards. The provision acknowledges that reduced parking may be appropriate in certain higher-density locations with convenient access to transit. The requirement for a conditional use permit discourages the use of this provision and there isn't guidance on how to determine the appropriate size of the parking reduction.

Existing	Recommendation														
Required parking can be reduced by up to fifty percent (50%) in the zones designated on the City's major transportation corridors such as San Pablo Avenue and International Boulevard with the granting of a Conditional Use Permit (CUP).	Required parking for residential units may be reduced per the following in the commercial corridor zones outside of Downtown. <i>However, under no circumstances can parking be reduced below 50% of the normally required amount.</i> <table border="0" style="width: 100%;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: left;"><u>Strategy</u></th> <th style="text-align: right;"><u>Reduction</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Car-sharing² (on-site or within 300 ft)</td> <td style="text-align: right;">10%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Free transit passes</td> <td style="text-align: right;">10%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Unbundled parking</td> <td style="text-align: right;">15%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Within ½ mile of a BART station or a Bus Rapid Transit stop (not including affordable housing)</td> <td style="text-align: right;">20%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Affordable housing <u>within</u> ½ mile of a BART station or a Bus Rapid Transit stop</td> <td style="text-align: right;">50%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Affordable housing <u>not within</u> ½ mile of a BART station or a Bus Rapid Transit stop</td> <td style="text-align: right;">20%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	<u>Strategy</u>	<u>Reduction</u>	Car-sharing ² (on-site or within 300 ft)	10%	Free transit passes	10%	Unbundled parking	15%	Within ½ mile of a BART station or a Bus Rapid Transit stop (not including affordable housing)	20%	Affordable housing <u>within</u> ½ mile of a BART station or a Bus Rapid Transit stop	50%	Affordable housing <u>not within</u> ½ mile of a BART station or a Bus Rapid Transit stop	20%
<u>Strategy</u>	<u>Reduction</u>														
Car-sharing ² (on-site or within 300 ft)	10%														
Free transit passes	10%														
Unbundled parking	15%														
Within ½ mile of a BART station or a Bus Rapid Transit stop (not including affordable housing)	20%														
Affordable housing <u>within</u> ½ mile of a BART station or a Bus Rapid Transit stop	50%														
Affordable housing <u>not within</u> ½ mile of a BART station or a Bus Rapid Transit stop	20%														

Rationale: Removing the Conditional Use Permit 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. The specific percentage reductions proposed are based on research, published standards, and practices from other cities. The Oakland Energy and Climate Action Plan (ECAP) contains a policy to establish alternative mechanisms to meeting parking requirements in order to reduce parking demand and greenhouse gas emission (Policy PA 35). The proposal would be consistent with this policy.

² Car sharing is a type of car rental that is designed to be convenient for people who want to rent 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. Car share organizations include, but are not limited to Zipcar and CityCarShare. Becoming a member of a car-share organization can reduce the need to purchase a car by people who live near transit

**Off-Street Parking Update
Public Review Draft of Parking Proposal
October 2015**

4. Parking Reductions – Senior Housing

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.

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.

Rationale: *Removing the conditional use permit requirement would encourage needed senior housing. Senior housing has a lower parking demand than typical residential uses.*

**Off-Street Parking Update
Public Review Draft of Parking Proposal
October 2015**

5. Change of Use within Existing Non-Historic Buildings

Problem: Under the current regulations, minimum parking requirements apply when the use of an existing building changes. For instance, a change of business may create a requirement for more parking at a site. (This requirement does not apply to buildings constructed after the parking regulations were first adopted in 1965 when the use of the building changes from a commercial activity to another commercial activity.) Requiring parking for existing buildings, many of which do not provide the required amount of parking for the proposed use, discourages reuse of existing buildings and complicates the permitting processes for new activities.

Existing	Proposed
Parking required for change of use of existing buildings (except pre-1965 buildings where change involves commercial activities)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No parking required for all changes of use within a “major use category”³. • Continue to require parking when use changes major use categories³. For example, a change of use from commercial to residential would generally increase the number of required parking spaces.

Rationale: *The proposal would encourage the reuse of existing buildings. There are successful projects involving the conversion of commercial buildings to live/work units where no parking is required by the current regulations. Proposed building uses that may result in neighborhood parking impacts (e.g., schools, churches, certain commercial activities) typically require a conditional use permit allowing the City to evaluate the appropriateness of the proposed parking on a case-by-case basis.*

³ Major use categories are defined in the Planning Code as “Residential”, “Civic”, “Commercial”, and “Industrial”. Within each major use category are several use classifications that are either permitted, conditionally permitted, or prohibited in each zoning designation. Examples of use classifications in the commercial major use category include “General Retail Sales”, “Full Service Restaurant”, and “Auto Repair and Cleaning”.

**Off-Street Parking Update
Public Review Draft of Parking Proposal
October 2015**

6. Additions to and Change of Use of Historic Buildings

Problem: Under the current regulations, minimum parking requirements apply to additions to and change of use of (generally from a commercial use to a residential use) of historic buildings. This discourages the rehabilitation of historic buildings. In many cases, providing new parking for additions to existing buildings creates visual or site design impacts, particularly historic buildings where new parking may adversely impact the setting of the building.

Existing	Recommendation
Parking required for additions to historic buildings and conversions of historic buildings to new major use categories.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No parking required for additions to historic buildings (Local Register Historic Properties) when the addition is less than 100% of the floor area of the existing building • Upon the granting of a Conditional Use Permit from the City, no parking required for any new use in Local Register Properties even across major use categories.

Rationale: *The proposal would encourage the reuse and rehabilitation of historic buildings while minimizing the impact of new parking. 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.*

**Off-Street Parking Update
Public Review Draft of Parking Proposal
October 2015**

7. Flexible Use Parking

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

Existing	Recommendation
<p>Required parking must be reserved for the activity it serves unless a permit is granted allowing an auto fee parking lot.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Required customer parking can be shared between commercial businesses and not be considered auto fee parking. • Parking on another lot for a conditionally permitted business would be considered an expansion the use and thus would require a Conditional Use Permit (CUP). For instance, a CUP is required for bars to operate in commercial zones, so providing parking for a bar on a lot with another business would be considered an expansion of the bar and require a CUP.

Rationale: *Allowing commercial businesses to share 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 parking (such as restaurants open at night) that are near other businesses with unused parking spaces (such as offices closed at night).*

**Off-Street Parking Update
Public Review Draft of Parking Proposal
October 2015**

8. 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 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): • If allowed as described in the previous item, 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 each commercial and high density residential zones. • Allow off-site parking for commercial businesses in all zones. • Required parking may be located off-site within 300 feet by right and 600 feet with 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.

**Off-Street Parking Update
Public Review Draft of Parking Proposal
October 2015**

9. Commercial Parking on Small Lots

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	Parking requirements do not apply to interior lots with less than 35 feet of street frontage in the CN zones.

Rationale: *Eliminating parking requirements on narrow lots would encourage more successful site design and reduce visual and physical impacts to the site and streetscape.*

**Off-Street Parking Update
Public Review Draft of Parking Proposal
October 2015**

10. Civic Activities in the S-15, S-15W, and D-CO-1 Transit-Oriented Development Zones

Problem: Under the current regulations, the amount of parking required for civic activities in these transit oriented zones is determined by the Director of City Planning on a case-by-case basis. Most civic activities are permitted by right in these zones. Requiring the Director to use judgment to determine the amount of parking required is challenging for activities permitted by right because there is no discretionary review required for the activities.

Existing	Recommendation
Parking requirement for civic activities determined by Director of City Planning on case-by-case basis.	No minimum number of spaces prescribed for civic activities.

Rationale: *Eliminating the minimum parking requirements would streamline the review of proposed civic activities in these Transit Oriented Zones and is consistent with their intent to encourage transit-oriented development. The amount of on-site parking would be determined by the project sponsor.*

**Off-Street Parking Update
Public Review Draft of Parking Proposal
October 2015**

11. 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. In 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 proposal would encourage appropriate residential infill development in these neighborhoods and allow existing residents to convert unused parking spaces to better uses. Due to their locations in walkable neighborhoods near transit, parking demand in RM Zones is less than in single-family residential zones, where two parking spaces per unit would still be required.*

**Off-Street Parking Update
Public Review Draft of Parking Proposal
October 2015**

12. 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: *The proposal would allow new parking up to the front lot line, which is consistent with typical parking behavior of residents with side or rear parking. Parking would still be required to be to the side or rear of the residence. The proposal would allow residents with driveways down the side of the residence to park up by the street and use the remaining driveway area for other purposes.*

**Off-Street Parking Update
Public Review Draft of Parking Proposal
October 2015**

13. 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.*

**Off-Street Parking Update
Public Review Draft of Parking Proposal
October 2015**

14. Aisle Width

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.

Existing	Recommendation
Residential = 21 ft. Commercial = 21 ft.	Residential = 21 ft. Commercial = 23 ft.

Rationale: *The proposal would provide adequate maneuvering space based on field tests by City staff and published national standards.*

**Off-Street Parking Update
Public Review Draft of Parking Proposal
October 2015**

15. 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.