

**OFF-STREET PARKING PROPOSAL
CITY OF OAKLAND PLANNING DEPARTMENT
North Oakland Community Meeting
March 7, 2016**

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 Passes 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 the value of an adult AC Transit monthly pass, currently \$75 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.

Off-Street Parking Update
Administrative Draft
March 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. 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
Administrative Draft
March 2016

3. Parking Reductions and Residential Parking Permits– 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.

Also, multi-family developments may reduce their parking to a lower level than will be required by their development if they use on-street parking in residential neighborhoods by purchasing a Residential Parking Permit (RPP). This can create spillover impacts in residential neighborhoods.

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. The City has no zoning requirements regarding RPPs, although prohibiting tenants of new multi-family developments to purchase RPPs has been a condition of approval for certain developments. 	<p>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:</p> <table border="0"> <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>Provision of Car sharing space (onsite).....</td> <td style="text-align: right;">20%³</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Provision of Car-sharing spaces¹ (within 300 ft)</td> <td style="text-align: right;">10%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Transit Pass provided for each unit⁴</td> <td style="text-align: right;">10%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Within ½ mile of a Major Transit Stop.⁵</td> <td style="text-align: right;">30%⁶</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>2) Prohibit tenants of developments with ten or more units to obtain RPPs.</p>	<u>Strategy</u>	<u>Reduction</u>	Provision of Car sharing space (onsite).....	20% ³	Provision of Car-sharing spaces ¹ (within 300 ft)	10%	Transit Pass provided for each unit ⁴	10%	Within ½ mile of a Major Transit Stop. ⁵	30% ⁶
<u>Strategy</u>	<u>Reduction</u>										
Provision of Car sharing space (onsite).....	20% ³										
Provision of Car-sharing spaces ¹ (within 300 ft)	10%										
Transit Pass provided for each unit ⁴	10%										
Within ½ mile of a Major Transit Stop. ⁵	30% ⁶										

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. With feedback from public hearings and additional research, staff recommends these potential reductions be expanded to multifamily projects throughout the City, not only in Downtown and high-density corridors. 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 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.

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

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.

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 significantly lower than market rate projects. Requiring parking minimums that exceed parking demand leads to overbuilt parking supply, which can increase overall housing costs by 6% or more and potentially occupy valuable real estate with underutilized parking spaces which could instead be used for additional housing units. Currently Oakland’s Code follows state law, allowing developers to apply for reductions in the City’s parking requirement for affordable units, yet the present default for affordable units is 1 space per unit. This puts the onus on the developer to request reduced parking minimums, when the City instead should be encouraging parking reductions by right. State law has recently changed with the passage of AB 744, which would supersede certain Oakland parking requirements as they currently stand.

Existing	Recommendation
<p>Required parking is 1 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

Off-Street Parking Update
Administrative Draft
March 2016

5. 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
Administrative Draft
March 2016

6. Unbundling

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. This way, renters or office space users that do not have cars and elect to have no parking can choose to have no parking, and pay less, while those that value the parking and have a need can choose a parking space if they are willing to pay for it. Studies have shown that unbundling reduces the number of parking spaces required in a building.

Existing	Recommendation
Unbundling is required for multifamily residential developments of 10 or more units in the D-BV and D-LM zones only.	Unbundling required for all multifamily residential developments of 10 or more units citywide.

Rationale: *When unbundling is instituted, data shows that some tenants do not opt for parking spaces and overall parking demand goes down.*

Off-Street Parking Update
Administrative Draft
March 2016

7. Maximum Parking in Transit Oriented Development zones

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. Specific Plans and zoning updates have adjusted parking minimums in many cases, allowing developers to build housing with low or in some cases no parking. However, lower minimums do not prevent developers from building more parking if they desire. In many parts of the City this may be acceptable, but in zones intended for high-density and walkability, with new development oriented around regional transit stops, the City should not only encourage less parking but prevent excess parking.

Existing	Recommendation
No parking maximums exist in any zone.	Implement a parking maximum for any residential development within the S-15, S-15W, and D-CO-1 zones, such that no development exceeds 1.25 spaces per unit.

Rationale: 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.

Off-Street Parking Update
Administrative Draft
March 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.	No parking required for additions to historic buildings 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. Change of Use within Existing Buildings

Problem: Under the current regulations, minimum parking requirements apply 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 “Major Use Category⁸” to another. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No parking required for any changes of use for historic buildings (Local Register Historic Properties). • For non-historic buildings, no parking required for any changes of use within a “major use category” such as Residential, Commercial, Civic, Industrial, or Agricultural and Extractive. • No parking required for additions to historic buildings when the addition is less than 100% of the floor area of the existing building

Rationale: *The proposal would encourage the reuse of existing buildings, particularly historic 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. 1965 is an arbitrary and increasingly remote date to affix a requirement for change of use parking requirements. Conversion of buildings for alternative uses should be encouraged to revive or restore existing buildings, with the understanding that this should not apply to new structures. The proposal would also encourage the reuse and rehabilitation 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 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 “Major Use Categories”: Residential, Civic, Commercial, Industrial, and Agricultural and Extractive.

Off-Street Parking Update
Administrative Draft
March 2016

9. Flexible Use Parking

Problem: In many commercial districts, there is a variety of commercial businesses 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 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
Required parking must be reserved for the activity it serves unless a permit is granted allowing an auto fee parking lot.	<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).*

10. 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): • 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 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
Administrative Draft
March 2016

11. Commercial Parking on Small Lots	
<p>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.</p>	
Existing	Recommendation
Parking requirements apply to all lots regardless of lot size except in the Broadway Valdez and Lake Merritt Station Specific Plan areas.	Parking requirements do not apply to interior lots with less than 35 feet of street frontage in the CN and CC zones.
<p>Rationale: <i>Eliminating parking requirements on narrow lots would encourage more successful site design and reduce visual and physical impacts to the site and streetscape.</i></p>	

Off-Street Parking Update
Administrative Draft
March 2016

12. 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) • Warehousing: 1 space per 3 employees • Industrial: 1 space per 1,500 sf or per 3 employees (whichever more) 	<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 • Warehousing: None for first 10,000 sf; then 1 space per 1,000 sf • Industrial: 1 space per 1,500 sf

Rationale: *With the realization that past estimates were likely flawed and potentially led to the overproduction of unnecessary parking, new minimums should err on the side of being slightly lower than the parking actually demanded at peak need. The Proposed scenario attempts to make these adjustments while using metrics that reflect usage and needs of the specific building type without depending on personnel estimates. They are based off extensive research and best practices used elsewhere (see “Unique Buildings” document for further details). For the “Alternative” Proposal scenario, the proposed amount of required parking is based on established guidelines for the number of employees per building area. In this scenario, the amount of required parking would not change, only the way the parking requirement is calculated.*

Off-Street Parking Update
Administrative Draft
March 2016

13. 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 in the S-15, S-15W, and D-CO-1 TOD Zones	Determined by Director of City Planning based on a parking demand and capacity study.

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
Administrative Draft
March 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. 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.*

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: *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
Administrative Draft
March 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.*

Off-Street Parking Update
Administrative Draft
March 2016

17. 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.*

18. 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.*