



MEMORANDUM

TO: Planning Commission

FROM: Travis Parker, Director, Planning Department

DATE: January 5, 2018

SUBJECT: Lakewood Development Dialogue – Parking

This memo is the fourth of five sets of recommended changes to the Lakewood zoning ordinance as a part of the Lakewood Development Dialogue process. The process began in August of 2017 with a joint study session of the Lakewood City Council and Planning Commission.

The Lakewood Development Dialogue portion of the LakewoodTogether.org website went live the second week of September. Over the past few months the site has had over 1,400 visitors and over 300 people have participated on one or more of the subject specific pages.

Three public open houses were hosted by staff and Planning Commission members between September 20 and September 27. Over 70 people attended one or more of the open houses with most providing feedback on one or more areas.

At a study session on October 25, the Planning Commission directed staff to examine 23 possible changes to the ordinance in 5 separate areas. This memo looks at recommended actions regarding parking. The five issues identified by Planning Commission regarding parking were:

- 1. Modify requirements for multi-family parking*
- 2. Modify requirements for restaurant parking*
- 3. Create new requirements for electric vehicles*
- 4. Expand or modify bicycle parking requirements*
- 5. Lower maximum number of cars on single family lots*
- 6. Modify minimum parking requirement for Mini-Warehouse or Storage*

Issue #1: Modify requirements for multi-family parking

Staff reviewed how other growing metropolitan areas use parking regulations based on area context, as well as academic and professional research and took away the following lessons:

- Parking space construction can be very costly and impact unit rent or sale costs so high parking requirements can be as damaging as low requirements
- Parking should be based on site context and resident demographics
- Reductions should be given to developments that target populations with low car ownership including seniors, low-income residents, and transit-oriented developments
- Unbundling parking (charging separately for parking from the cost of the home) can reduce demand for on-site parking, but can create need for on-street parking, and parking management.

Research

King County Washington, Right Size Parking

King County Metro Transit analyzed parking utilization at 208 sites around metro Seattle, and created a tool to help determine the parking needed for multi-family development based on neighborhood context, and transportation demand management strategies. The research found that parking was consistently over-supplied for multi-family housing sites. It also found strong correlations between average rent, parking price as a fraction of rent, and size of units.

King County Urban Form	Spaces Supplied per Unit	Spaces Utilized per Unit
Central Business District	.80	.59
Urban	1.37	1.00
Suburban	1.60	1.20

All sites were within growth or activity centers¹, or within .5-miles of a rail station, or .25-miles of a bus route that runs at 15-minute intervals during weekdays and 30-minute intervals weeknight and weekends. Similar bus routes in Lakewood include those on Alameda, Colfax, Wadsworth and Sheridan. Compared to the King County study area, Lakewood has areas similar to the Urban and Suburban forms.

Cost to Construct Parking

According to the Victoria Transportation Institute, the average construction cost for a Denver parking structure in 2017 is \$52.60 per square foot, or \$17,571 per space. Surface parking can cost between \$5,000 and \$10,000 per space to construct, depending on topography and other factors. This adds to overall development costs. The same report finds that “based on typical affordable urban housing development costs, one parking space per unit increases total development costs by about 12.5%, and two parking spaces increase costs by about 25%.”

¹ Puget Sound Regional Council defines Urban Growth Centers as a part of the regional planning process. Growth centers have been identified for housing and employment growth, as well as for regional funding. King County defines Activity Centers as a part of the recently adopted Strategic Plan Service Guidelines. Activity Centers are areas of concentrated activity that connect the County’s all-day and peak transit network.

Context-based Parking Reductions

A common alternative to low parking minimums is parking minimum reductions based on site use and site characteristics.

In Wheatridge, there is a minimum of 1.5 spaces per residential multifamily unit. However, multifamily developments in mixed-use commercial Transit Oriented Development districts may reduce the parking minimum by 20% to 1.2 spaces per unit. According to the Wheatridge zoning code:

Parking reductions may only be granted by the community development director upon finding that the proposed reduction:

- a. Will create minimal spillover parking onto adjacent property or public rights-of-way;
- b. Will not adversely affect traffic circulation patterns on or off site; and
- c. Will promote quality urban design equally or better than a plan that strictly complies with the (parking standards).

The community development director may require a traffic generation study prepared by a professional engineer in order to determine that the criteria above have been met.

Outside of mixed-use zone districts, Wheatridge determines the minimum number of parking spaces based on bedrooms in each unit. This method is based on the assumption of multiple drivers with separate cars in each unit, but provides an excess of parking for households such as families with one car. It also discourages developers from building apartments more appropriate for multi-generational households.

In Minneapolis, parking reductions are permitted based on proximity to frequent-running transit. This is used as incentive to build multi-family developments close to transit. The reductions allowed are tiered based on the number of units in a development, which allows for sensitivity to potential on-street parking as a result of low on-site parking requirements. Minneapolis Transit Incentive Parking Reductions for multiple family dwelling as follows:

Transit proximity and frequency	Authorized reduction from minimum parking requirement	
	3-50 units	51+ units
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within .25 miles of a bus transit stop with midday service headways of 15 minutes or less, or • Within .5 miles of a rail transit stop with midday service headways of 15 minutes or less 	100 %	50 %
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within 350 feet of a bus or rail transit stop with midday service headways between 15 and 30 minutes 	10 %	10 %

Building on this idea, Lakewood could offer parking reductions in exchange for transit-passes or pass-subsidies at locations that meet these requirements. Developers could then work with RTD to begin a Neighborhood EcoPass program.²

² RTD is examining fare pass policy right now and is considering ending neighborhood passes. If RTD chooses to eliminate the program, the city would find an alternative pass program or subsidy system.

Transportation Research Board

The study detailed in this paper found strong positive correlation between income and vehicle availability rates. This supports parking minimum reductions for income-restricted housing, as lower income households are less likely to have multiple vehicles. It also found strong positive correlations between number of bedrooms and vehicle availability.

Counts conducted with the survey found that many of the sites had excess parking during overnight counts. Insufficient parking or perception thereof often comes from poor management, especially for visitors. For example, a development with more spaces than units could assign one space to each unit, and remaining spaces would be available to additional tenant vehicles and visitors.) The research recommends a series of three approaches to manage these issues.³

1. Set minimum requirements close to local demand estimates using counts, census data, and household surveys for renters in the area
 - a. Condition site plan approval on parking management plans
2. Require parking to be charged separately from rent (unbundling)

note: This requires on-street parking management via pricing or time limitation
3. Eliminate parking minimums for transit-oriented developments
 - a. Eliminate parking minimums citywide once unbundling and on-street parking pricing becomes widespread

Lakewood Facts and Figures

Parking statistics for recent multifamily development

Project	Parking Spaces	Units	Zoning Context	Code Year	Min. Ratio	Max. ratio	Parking Ratio
Lamar Station Crossing	115	110	T	2010	1	n/a	1.1
West Link at Oak Station	163	111	U	2012	1	2	1.5
Holland Belmar Block 13+14	238	220	U	2012	1	2	1.1
Zephyr Line	95	95	U	2014	.75	2	1.0
Union West	443	267	S	2014	.75	3	1.7
Cityscape at Belmar	117	130	U	2014	.75	2	0.9
West Line Flats	176	155	U	2015	.75	2	1.1
Beacon 85	434	335	U	2015	.75	2	1.3
40 West	60	60	U	2015	.75	2	1.0

Only two multifamily developments in recent years have provided less than one off-street parking space for each unit. Both would qualify for parking minimum reductions if they were permitted for income restricted, senior housing, and transit proximity reductions.

³ Parking demand and zoning requirements for suburban multifamily housing. 2010. Transportation Research Board

Zephyr Line is located .25 miles from a rail station, is restricted to households making 60% of AMI, has an abundance of street parking available, and facilitated the creation of curb, gutter and detached sidewalk along the perimeter of the site. Cityscape at Belmar is income-restricted senior housing, in an intensely mixed-use neighborhood, with street parking and frequent transit connections.

December 2017 parking counts at new multifamily developments

Project	Parking Standards		Night Count Spaces			Midday Count Spaces		
	Parking Ratio	Total	Open	Used	% Used	Open	Used	% Used
Lamar Station Crossing	1.05	115	24	91	79%	57	58	50%
Union West	1.66	426	*	*	*	266	160	38%
West Line Flats	1.14	129	58	71	55%	88	41	32%
40 West	1.00	60	35	25	42%	52	8	13%

*Staff was unable to enter garage for nighttime count.

According to 2016 American Community Survey (Census) data

- 61% of Lakewood renting households have **1 or no vehicles**
 - 13% have **no vehicles**
 - 48% have only **1 vehicle**
- 73% of Lakewood renting households live in **multifamily buildings** (3 units or more)

Recommendation #1

- *Raise minimum parking to 1 space per unit throughout the city*
- *Condition site approval for parking space ratios below 1.25 on:*
 - *parking management strategy to address visitor parking*
 - *unbundling of parking costs, or parking space cash-out for car-less tenants*
- *Offer parking reductions in Transit contexts, and near frequent transit if the project meets conditions such as:*
 - *Income restricted units*
 - *Senior housing*
 - *Provision of RTD pass or pass-subsidy to residents*
- *Add requirement for visitor parking in multi-family residential above 4 units*

Issue #2: Modify requirements for restaurant parking

Currently Lakewood’s parking standards require a minimum of 2 spaces per 1,000 s.f. of restaurant space. Maximums are based on context, with 12 spaces per 1,000 s.f. as the highest maximum in the city, in suburban areas. This combination allows the builder to determine the number of spaces needed within this range, based on market factors and anticipated parking demand. In other cities, different factors are used to determine parking requirements.

Research

Littleton Restaurant Parking

- (1) Drive-Thru Type: One space per 65 square feet of gross floor area. (15/ 1,000 sf)
- (2) Carry-Out: One space per 140 square feet of gross floor area. (7/ 1,000 sf)
- (3) Sit-Down without Liquor License: One space per 65 square feet of gross floor area. (15/1,000 sf)
- (4) Sit-Down with Liquor License: One space per 75 square feet of gross floor area. (13/ 1,000 sf)

Arvada Restaurant Parking

Arvada parking requirements are based on number of seats in a restaurant. For general restaurants, the city requires 1 space per 3 seats, and 1 space per 4 seats in fast food restaurants.

Denver Restaurant Parking

Denver adjusts zoning according to neighborhood context. Main Street is an overlay that is used in areas of all districts, along major corridors that are pedestrian oriented, or are becoming so.

Denver Zoning Context	Lakewood Context Equivalent	Minimum Spaces Required
Main Street (all districts)	Transit	2/1,000 s.f.
Urban Center	Transit	2.5/1,000 s.f.
Urban General	Urban	3.75/ 1,000 s.f.
Urban Edge	Suburban	4.5/1,000 s.f.
Suburban	Suburban	5/1,000 s.f.

Wheatridge Parking

Throughout the city, eating and drinking establishments are required to provide 1 space per 100 sf of floor area. In mixed-use zone districts, the minimum requirement is 1 space per 1,000 sf, and the maximum is 12 spaces per 1,000 sf.

General

Restaurants are notoriously difficult businesses for which to predict correct parking ratios. Success of a business (especially a local independent restaurant) cannot be precisely anticipated. Furthermore, zoning cannot be written to address every unique challenge of urban infill individually. Therefore, a combination of regulation, flexibility, and market forces are often needed to provide the best outcomes.

Critiques of various methods vary. Requirements based on the square-footage of restaurants can burden higher-end restaurants with more space for patrons. On the other hand, basing spaces on number of seats may discourage restaurants with high-density seating, like diners. All requirements make an impact on restaurant development budgets.

This impact is important to keep in mind, as LDD comments repeatedly ask for and reference neighborhood serving restaurants and retail as a component of successful mixed-use, and as needed amenities throughout the city.

Recommendation #2:

- *Increase restaurant minimum parking ratio to 3 per 1,000 square feet throughout the city*
- *Modify stand-alone surface parking limitations to allow along arterial and collector streets in suburban contexts*

Issue #3: Create new requirements for electric vehicles

Staff has identified EV standards for both public and private use that align with potential building code updates. Additional parking enhancements related to sustainability, including designated carpool and carshare spaces are included in the Enhanced Development Menu recommended in the Site Design memo.

Background and Trends

The City of Lakewood Sustainability Plan sets goals to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and promote alternative fuel vehicles to the Lakewood community. The expansion of EV infrastructure is a key opportunity to advance those goals and improve the poor air quality in the region. In addition to the environmental and health benefits of EV adoption, the Colorado PEV (plug-in electric vehicles, derive all or part of their power from electricity) market has grown rapidly over the past few years, with 43 percent growth in 2016 sales compared to 2015, and a 48 percent increase in sales in the first quarter of 2017 compared to the same period in 2016.⁴ The Colorado Energy Office projects continued growth, estimating that 5 percent of vehicles on the road in 2030 will be PEVs.

Costs for EV charging stations have decreased over the past several years as technology has improved. Stations can be divided into three primary types with varying costs⁵.

Type (Single Port)	Unit Cost Range
Level 1 (2-5 miles of range per hour of charging)	\$300-\$1,500
Level 2 (10-20 miles of range per hour of charging)	\$400-\$6,500
DC Fast Charging (DCFC) (60-80 miles of range in 20 minutes of charging)	\$10,000-\$40,000

These costs increase dramatically (ranging from \$3,500-\$12,500 for commercial properties⁶) if the EV infrastructure is not in place and the property must retrofit. Therefore, it is widely recommended that, at minimum, communities require EV infrastructure at the time of development. This can range in extent, but generally, new regulations are requiring that new parking garages and surface parking lots are constructed with EV capability in mind. New York City's legislation requires that a minimum of 20% of parking spaces in new-construction and upgraded lots be embedded with conduit for EV charging. In San Francisco, legislation requires 10% of spaces to be "turnkey ready" for EV charger installation, 10% to "flexible" for charging and upgrades, and 80% "capable" with conduit run to all parking spaces.

⁴ Opportunities for Vehicle Electrification in the Denver Metro area and Across Colorado. 2017. City & County of Denver, Department of Environmental Health.

⁵ Costs Associated with non-Residential Electric Vehicle Supply Equipment. 2015. U.S. Department of Energy Vehicle Technologies Office.

⁶ EVSE Installation and Unit Cost Estimates for Lakewood. 2017. Southwest Energy Efficiency Project.

EV Requirement Mechanisms

EV Infrastructure is supported through various policy and planning tools. Below is a list of five ways that communities can encourage EVs, along with Lakewood's current status⁷.

1. **Zoning** determines which land uses allow, incentivize, or require EV infrastructure
 - *Lakewood is addressing this through the Lakewood Development Dialogue.*
2. **Parking** sets the scope and enforcement requirements for parking, such as parking space ratios, signage, and accessibility.
 - *Lakewood regulates parking through the zoning ordinance and is now addressing this through the Lakewood Development Dialogue.*
3. **Codes** ensures safe infrastructure installation through building construction specifications.
 - *Lakewood is currently in the process of updating its building codes from the 2009 International Building Codes or "I-Codes" to the 2015 I-Codes with local amendments. One of the proposed amendments is to provide safe and consistent EV infrastructure when EV spaces are required by the zoning code. The I-Codes will be reviewed by the Board of Appeals and City Council before being considered for adoption in Spring 2018.*
4. **Permitting and Inspection** ensure the administrative process is efficient and affordable.
 - *Lakewood processes are dependent on the outcomes of the Lakewood Development Dialogue and the upcoming building code update.*
5. **Partnership and Procurement** works with private partners to implement infrastructure.
 - *Lakewood provides educational information through Lakewood.org.*
 - *Opportunities for partnership could expand with zoning ordinance and building code amendments.*

⁷ [Creating EV-Ready Towns and Cities: A Guide to Planning and Policy Tools](#). 2012. New York State Energy Research and Development Authority and Transportation and Climate Initiative.

Recommended EV Zoning and Parking Requirements:

A. General Standards:

- a. Alignment with building code** – Definitions and requirements should align with building code.
- b. Charging Station Level** – Required EV charging stations should be at minimum a Level 2 electric vehicle charging station. Higher levels are encouraged, but not required.
- c. Signage** – Each electric vehicle charging station should include guide signage identifying spaces as restricted parking “EXCEPT FOR ELECTRIC VEHICLE CHARGING”. For purposes of this section, “charging” means that an electric vehicle is parked at an electric vehicle charging station and is connected to the electric vehicle supply equipment port. If time limits or vehicle removal provisions are to be enforced, regulatory signage including parking restrictions shall be installed immediately adjacent to, and visible from the electric vehicle charging station.
- d. Fee Collection** – The property owner is not restricted from collecting a service fee for the use of an electric vehicle charging station made available to residents, employees and visitors to the property. Collection of charging station fees shall not affect the zoning land use classification of properties where EV charging stations are installed as accessory uses.
- e. Accessible Parking Spaces** - it is strongly encouraged, but not required under these bylaws, that when any EV Charging Stations are required, a minimum of one accessible EV Charging Station be provided. Accessible EV Charging Stations should have a barrier-free route of travel and be in close proximity to the building. It is not necessary to designate the accessible EV Charging Station exclusively for disabled users. Separate from these regulations, the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) may require EV Charging Stations to meet accessibility requirements.

B. Private EV Charging Station Standards:

- a. Applicability** – Land uses that include overnight stay or significant visit duration
- b. Threshold** – Developments that meet one of the following conditions:
 - 1. New development with more than 10, off-street parking spaces; or
 - 2. The parking capacity of an existing development with 20 or more total spaces is increased by 30 percent or more.
- c. Number of Ports** – EV charging ports (multiple ports may be on one station) are to be included in the calculation for both the number of minimum and maximum vehicle spaces required, as provided by Table 17.8.1. The number of EV charging

ports required to be installed at the time of development is stated as a percentage of the total number of new or additional parking spaces in Column A of the table below. Requirements will be rounded to closest whole number, but will always be a value of at least one EV charging port to be available at the time of development. To meet anticipated demand for EV charging stations Column B specifies the required electrical capacity to enable future EV charging ports.

Land Use	A: Charging Ports Required at Time of Development	B: Electrical Capacity for Future Charging Ports	C. Total Percent of EV Ready Parking⁸
	<i>(minimum % of new or added parking spaces)</i>		
Multifamily dwelling unit	5%	15%	20%
Group Residential Facility	2%	3%	5%
Shelter	2%	3%	5%
Bed and Breakfast	2%	3%	5%
Club, Lodge, or Service Organization	2%	3%	5%
Entertainment Facility (Indoor or Outdoor)	2%	3%	5%
Golf Course	2%	3%	5%
Hotel	2%	3%	5%
Motel	2%	3%	5%
Office	2%	3%	5%
Parking, Stand-Alone	*	*	*
Community Building	2%	3%	5%
Convention or Exposition Center	2%	3%	5%
Correctional Institution	2%	3%	5%
Hospital	2%	3%	5%
Religious Institution	2%	3%	5%
School, Public or Private, Elementary and Middle and High	2%	3%	5%
School, Vocational or Trade	2%	3%	5%
University or College	2%	3%	5%

*Requirements will be based on associated uses.

⁸ Based on expected EV market share in Colorado by 2030. Staff recommends revisiting these standards as projections are updated.

C. **Public EV Charging Station Standards:** Developments that must comply with the Enhanced Development Menu may choose to install publicly accessible EV Charging Stations to meet the Menu requirements.

Recommended EV Zoning and Parking Supplemental Materials

To help developers, property managers, and other stakeholders navigate the process of installing and operating charging stations, it is recommended that staff develop best practice guides based on the types of anticipated users and associated challenges.

In addition, it is recommended that staff continue to track electric vehicle emerging technologies and market trends to adjust the requirements and guides as necessary.

Recommendation #3: Adopt requirements based on general standards above for electric vehicle infrastructure.

- ***Adopt requirements for charging ports based on table above***
- ***Include publicly-available electric vehicle infrastructure as an option in an enhanced development menu***
- ***Develop best practices guide for stakeholders in EV installation process***
- ***Continue to monitor electric vehicle trends to keep up to date on changing technology***

Issue #4: Expand or modify bicycle parking requirements

Staff has identified potential standards to increase the availability and quality of end-of-trip bicycle facilities, such as parking and changing facilities.

Short-Term Bicycle Parking Site Planning Best Practices

In a report by the Association of Pedestrian and Bicycle Professionals⁹, seven key site planning practices were identified to increase the convenience, utility, and security for short term parking.

1. Convenient to the cyclist destination
2. Placed no more than 50’ from the door, otherwise cyclists may lock to other street furniture or trees.
3. Visible from the destination to reassure cyclists about the security of the rack.
4. Located in a high-traffic area with passive surveillance or eyes on the street.
5. Identified by a sign at the visitor entrance
6. Located along the “desire line” from adjacent bikeways; the path that cyclists are most likely to travel.
7. Weather-protected, by siting racks under existing structures or installing free-standing structures when possible

Below is a table of several Platinum, Gold, and Silver Bicycle Friendly Communities, along with Lakewood, noting which communities have adopted the practices into their ordinances.

Short-Term Bicycle Parking Practice	<u>Portland, OR</u> (Platinum)	<u>Eugene, OR</u> (proposed) (Gold)	<u>Minneapolis, MN</u> (Gold)	<u>Lakewood, CO</u> (Bronze)
1. Convenient to destination	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
2. No more than 50’ from door	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
3. Visible from the destination	No	Yes	No	No
4. Located in a high-traffic area	No	No	No	No
5. Sign (if not visible from entrance)	Yes	No	No	No
6. Located on desire-line	Yes	Yes	No	No
7. Weather-protected	No	Yes	No	No

⁹ Bicycle Parking Guidelines 2nd Edition. 2010. Association of Pedestrian and Bicycle Professionals.
<https://www.fcgov.com/bicycling/pdf/apbp-2010-bicycleparkingguidelines2.pdf>

Long-Term Bicycle Parking Site Planning Best Practices

In a report by the Association of Pedestrian and Bicycle Professionals¹⁰, seven key site planning practices were identified to increase convenience, utility, and security for long term parking:

1. Easy access via effective guide signage
2. Controlled access:
 - Leased lockers
 - On-demand lockers
 - Keycard/code access garage cage or bicycle room
3. Higher security from controlled access to cages rooms or lockers.
4. Safeguards for users such as effective lighting and visible surveillance cameras or security guards.
5. Weather protection:
 - a) Free-standing shelter
 - b) Indoor cage or room
6. Lockers and showers for longer commutes or extremely hot or inclement climates.
7. Outreach to users to educate them about the presence of facilities.

Below is a table of several Platinum, Gold, and Silver Bicycle Friendly Communities, along with Lakewood, noting which communities have adopted the practices into their ordinances.

Long-Term Bicycle Parking Practice	<u>Portland, OR</u> <i>(Platinum)</i>	<u>Eugene, OR</u> <i>(proposed)</i> <i>(Gold)</i>	<u>Minneapolis, MN</u> <i>(Gold)</i>	<u>Lakewood, CO</u> <i>(Bronze)</i>
1. Signage <i>(if not visible from entrance)</i>	Yes	No	No	No
2. Controlled access	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
3. Higher security levels	No	No	No	No
4. Safeguards	Yes <i>(alternative to controlled access)</i>	Yes	Yes <i>(alternative to controlled access)</i>	Yes <i>(alternative to controlled access)</i>
5. Weather protection	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
6. Lockers and showers	No	No	No	No
7. Outreach	No	No	No	No

Portland Oregon, which received a platinum ranking has strong standards to ensure that bicycle parking is secure, convenient, and safeguards against damage. These standards for long term bicycle parking address bicycle lockers, bicycle racks, parking and maneuvering areas, covered

¹⁰ Bicycle Parking Guidelines 2nd Edition. 2010. Association of Pedestrian and Bicycle Professionals.
<https://www.fcgov.com/bicycling/pdf/apbp-2010-bicycleparkingguidelines2.pdf>

bicycle parking, signs and the intended use of required parking spaces. Standards are summarized below.

- Bicycle lockers must be securely anchored.
- Bicycle racks must be securely anchored and meet the following standards.
 - The bicycle frame and one wheel can be locked to the rack with a high security, U-shaped shackle lock if both wheels are left on the bicycle;
 - A space 2 feet by 6 feet must be provided for each required bicycle parking space, so that a bicycle six feet long can be securely held with its frame supported so that the bicycle cannot be pushed or fall in a manner that will damage the wheels or components.
- Parking and maneuvering areas must be designed so that bicycles are accessible without moving other bicycles
 - There must be a 5-foot-wide aisle behind all bicycle parking to allow for maneuvering, maneuvering may extend into sidewalk right-of-way
 - Bicycle parking area must be hard-paved
- Covered bicycle parking not within a building or locker must provide cover that is
 - Permanent
 - Protects the bicycle from rainfall
 - Is at least 7 feet above the floor or ground
- If bicycle parking is not visible from the main land use, a sign must be posted at the building entrance or applicable land use center.
- Required short-term bicycle parking spaces must be available for shoppers, customers, messengers, and other visitors to the site.
- Required long-term bicycle parking spaces must be available for employees, students, residents, commuters, and others who stay at the site for several hours.¹¹

Recommendation #4: Adopt the following standards for bicycle parking:

- *Short-term bicycle parking shall be located in a high-traffic area with passive surveillance or eyes on the street.*
- *Short-term bicycle parking shall be located along the “desire line” from adjacent bikeways; the path that cyclists are most likely to travel.*
- *Long-term bicycle parking shall provide parking some maneuvering areas sufficient to prevent conflict with other bicycles*
- *Shower and changing facilities are required when long-term bicycle parking is required in employment-based buildings above a certain sq. footage.*
- *Change long term bicycle parking requirements for Mini-Warehouse or Storage from 1 space per 10,000 SF to 1 per 20,000 SF.*
- *Change long term and short bicycle parking requirements for Warehouse or Distribution from 1 space per 2,500 SF to 1 space per 5,000 SF and from 1 space per 5,000 SF to 1 space per 10,000 SF.*

¹¹ Title 33, Planning and Zoning. 33,26 Parking and Loading. Portland Oregon, 2017.

Issue #5: Lower maximum number of cars on single family lots

“Also, the parking limits are too high (7 per lot) not including street parking for the size of the lots and the frontage. The number of cars should be reduced to be the number that fits the individual property instead of a fixed number.”

This comment and others are likely a misinterpretation of the existing ordinances. The municipal code in conjunction with the zoning ordinance currently limit residents to 7 vehicles parked on a residential property with a single-family detached home in suburban contexts. The vehicle maximum does not apply to those stored in buildings such as garages or sheds.

The assertion that the maximum should be based on “the number that fits” is addressed by the zoning ordinance, because lots are confined by a series of site design requirements. These include maximum driveway width, open space minimums, setbacks, and improved-surface requirements. The city does not and cannot regulate the number of cars a resident owns. The city can only regulate the number of cars parked outside of structures on a private property, and safety, as it pertains to parking on public streets. The city is limited in the ability to prohibit people from lawfully parking their regular passenger vehicles on public streets. More restrictive regulations do apply to recreational vehicles, travel trailers, utility trailers, boats trailers, and commercial vehicles.

Reducing the maximum number of cars allowed on single family lots would likely result in more cars parking on public streets. If residents want to enforce limitations on street-parking, Lakewood could replicate regulatory systems used in other municipalities.

Examples

In Denver neighborhoods with high parking demand, parking on some streets is limited by duration and time of day. Residents can apply and pay for permits, which allows them to park (*only*) on their block regardless of parking restrictions, for up to 72 hours at a time. Residency is proven by vehicle registration and a valid driver’s license to an address on that street, as well as a utility bill to the registered owner at that address.

In cities such as San Francisco and Houston, parking benefits districts apply economic principles to on-street public parking. According to UCLA research professor Donald Shoup, in these districts, drivers pay market price for permits, which are limited to the number of on-street spaces, or parking meters. Then the permit revenue pays for neighborhood public services.

Recommendation #5: Do not make any changes to maximum number of vehicles on single family lots at this time. In the future, if neighborhoods want to regulate vehicles parked on public streets, the City may assess the viability of a resident parking permit or parking benefits district program.

Issue #6: Modify minimum parking requirement for Mini-Warehouse or Storage

Staff has identified potential conflicts with the minimum vehicle parking requirement for the Mini-Warehouse or Storage use. Since 2015, The Planning Commission has approved Special Use Permits for 5 mini-storage facilities. The approvals were for a new type of mini-storage facility that is generally located in one building, 100,000 SF in size, three stories in height, and climate controlled.

Two of the mini-storage approvals were required to provide first floor retail space, one provided first floor flex office space and two were approved with only mini-storage uses. All 5 of the facilities requested relief from the minimum vehicle parking standard. Operators for these facilities have generally stated that our minimum vehicle parking standard is about twice what is required for a mini-storage facility. Trips to these facilities occur at all hours of the day and on weekends and are short duration as the clientele are unloading or picking up items in storage.

Recommendation #6: Increase the square footage requirement to calculate minimum parking requirements from 1,000 SF per parking space to 2,500 SF per parking space.