# Parking research and policy overview

Prepared by Chris McCahill

Madison Transportation Policy & Planning Board

May 17, 2021

1



# The High Cost of Free Parking

#### **DONALD SHOUP**

- \$25,000 per space or more for a parking garage<sup>1</sup>
- Adds \$1,700 per year for an average apartment<sup>2</sup>
- Adds 12-13% for a home or condo<sup>3</sup>
- Lost tax revenues<sup>4</sup>

## Space for parking



# Parking supply vs. demand

- Residential parking studies:
  - 26% empty across Boston<sup>1</sup>
  - 31% empty across Seattle<sup>2</sup>
  - 40% empty across DC<sup>3</sup>
  - 44% empty across Chicago<sup>4</sup>
  - 33% empty across Madison<sup>5</sup>  $\rightarrow$
- Downtown parking studies<sup>6</sup>:
  - 65% more than needed, on average
  - 45% more than needed in places with perceived shortages



1. MAPC (2017) 2. Rowe et al. (2013) 3. Rogers et al. (2016) 4. CNT (2016) 5. McCahill (2017) 6. Weinberger & Karlin-Resnick (2015)

4

# Parking and travel behavior

- Free parking at work increases driving by around 35-45% in urban areas<sup>1,2</sup>
- Free parking at home increases driving and lowers transit use<sup>3-8</sup>
- Charging a small amount can have a large impact, especially hourly or daily<sup>9</sup>



Sources: Stevens (2017); Kuzmyak et al. (2003)

1. Hess (2001)4. Manville et al. (2013)7. Auchincloss et al. (2015)2. Shoup & Breinholt (1997)5. Weinberger et al. (2008)8. Manville & Pinski (2020)3. Guo (2013)6. Weinberger (2012)9. Khordagui (2019)

5

## Parking and driving in cities



Cambridge, MA

**0.1 spaces** per 1,000 sq. ft. building space

New Haven, CT

**0.6 spaces** per 1,000 sq. ft. building space

Hartford, CT

**0.9 spaces** per 1,000 sq. ft. building space



# Parking policy levers in Madison

- Parking Utility
  - Public lots and garages
  - On-street meters
  - On-street regulations
- Private parking
  - Zoning code  $\rightarrow$
  - Proposed TDM
  - TIF

#### Madison zoning (sample)

| Land use              | Minimum                                      | Maximum   |  |
|-----------------------|--|---|--|
| Single family housing | 1  | 4   |  |
| Multifamily housing   | 1 per unit                                   | 2.5 per unit                                      |  |
| Office                | 2.5 per 1,000 sq. ft.<br>(1 per 400 sq. ft.) | <b>4 per 1,000 sq. ft.</b><br>(1 per 250 sq. ft.) |  |
| Retail                | 2.5 per 1,000 sq. ft.<br>(1 per 400 sq. ft.) | <b>5 per 1,000 sq. ft.</b><br>(1 per 200 sq. ft.) |  |
| Restaurant            | 15% of capacity                              | 40% of capacity                                   |  |

Many exemptions, including central area.

### **Proposed TDM (transportation demand management)**

|   | Small                      | Low-<br>Medium           | Medium                    | High-<br>Medium            | Large               |  |
|---|----------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------|--|
| RESIDENTIAL USES  | 10-25 DU                   | 26-50 DU                 | 51-100 DU                 | 101-150 DU                 | > 150 DU            |  |
| EMPLOYMENT USES   | 10,000 -<br>25,000 sq.ft.  | 25,001<br>-50,000 sq.ft. | 50,001<br>-100,000 sq.ft. | 100,001<br>-150,000 sq.ft. | > 150,000<br>sq.ft. |  |
| Parking stalls per<br>Dwelling Unit (DU) or<br>500 sq.ft. of floor area | Mitigation points required |                          |                           |                            |                     |  |
| < 0.5   | 5                          | 8                        | 10                        | 12                         | 15                  |  |
| 0.5 - 0.99  | 10                         | 12                       | 15                        | 18                         | 20                  |  |
| 1.0 - 1.49  | 15                         | 18                       | 20                        | 22                         | 25                  |  |
| 1.5 - 1.99  | 20                         | 22                       | 25                        | 28                         | 30                  |  |
| 2.0 - 2.5   | 25                         | 28                       | 30                        | 32                         | 35                  |  |
| 2.5 +   | 30                         | 32                       | 35                        | 38                         | 40                  |  |

More parking = more points required.



Basic measures B-1 to B-3



Information & communication IC-1 to IC-3



Active transportation AT-1 to AT-8



Parking management P-1 to P-4



High-occupancy vehicles HOV-1 to HOV-7



Land use + location LU-1 to LU-6

#### Parking management points

| Category | Measure                                  | Option  | Points | <b>Considerations &amp; Description</b>  |
|----------|--|---|--------|--|
| P-1      | Priced parking                           | A: Cash out for<br>employees                            | 5      | Offer all full-time employees the choice to forgo<br>free parking for an in-lieu cash payment of at<br>least \$50 per month.   |
|          |  | B: Direct charge to<br>employees                        | 5      | Charge employees at least \$50 per month to park, with an option to forgo that fee by not  |
|          |  | C: Unbundled for residents                              | 5      | Lease or sell parking separately to residents from residential space. Fees/leases for parking must be optional.  |
|          |  | D: Unbundled for<br>employment or<br>commercial tenants | 3      | Lease or sell parking to employers or commercial<br>tenants from space for those land uses.<br>Fees/leases for parking must be optional.   |
|          |  | E: Hourly or daily<br>parking charges                   | 5      | Directly charge building users who have not<br>purchased ongoing parking rights at least \$1/hour<br>to park. Points earned for this measure can be in<br>addition to other poins in P-1.  |
| P-2      | Shared parking<br>agreement              |   | 2      | Keep parking capacity below the applicable<br>parking minimum by sharing parking with a<br>nearby land use, or allow users at another land<br>use to park on-site such that that facility has<br>parking capacity below applicable parking |
| P-3      | Off-site<br>parking                      |   | 1      | Keep parking capacity below the applicable<br>parking minimum by contracting with an off-site<br>parking supplier, including but not limited to city<br>Parking Utility ramps.   |
| P-4      | Carpool<br>preferential/<br>free parking |   | 2      | Provide free or preferentially sited parking for<br>carpool vehicles for employees, shoppers,<br>students, or others as applicable.  |

### References

Auchincloss, A. H., Weinberger, R., Aytur, S., Namba, A., & Ricchezza, A. (2015). Public Parking Fees and Fines: A Survey of U.S. Cities. *Public Works Management & Policy*, 201(1), 49–59. https://doi.org/10.1177/1087724X13514380
Blanc, B. P., Gangi, M., Atkinson-Palombo, C., McCahill, C., & Garrick, N. W. (2014). Effects of Urban Fabric Changes on Real Estate Property Tax Revenue. *Transportation Research Record: Journal of the Transportation Research Board*, 2453, 145–152. https://doi.org/10.3141/2453-18

Center for Neighborhood Technology. (2016). *Stalled Out: How Empty Parking Spaces Diminish Neighborhood Affordability*. http://www.cnt.org/publications/stalled-out-how-empty-parking-spaces-diminish-neighborhood-affordability Gabbe, C. J., & Pierce, G. (2017). Hidden Costs and Deadweight Losses: Bundled Parking and Residential Rents in the Metropolitan United States. *Housing Policy Debate*, *27*(2), 217–229. https://doi.org/10.1080/10511482.2016.1205647

Guo, Z. (2013). Does residential parking supply affect household car ownership? The case of New York City. Journal of Transport Geography, 26, 18–28. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jtrangeo.2012.08.006

Hess, D. B. (2001). Effect of Free Parking on Commuter Mode Choice: Evidence from Travel Diary Data. Transportation Research Record: Journal of the Transportation Research Board, 1753, 35-42.

Jia, W., & Wachs, M. (1999). Parking Requirements and Housing Affordability: Case Study of San Francisco. Transportation Research Record: Journal of the Transportation Research Board, 1685(99), 156–160. https://doi.org/10.3141/1685-20

Khordagui, N. (2019). Parking prices and the decision to drive to work: Evidence from California. Transportation Research Part A, 130 (September), 479-495. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tra.2019.09.064

Kuzmyak, J. R., Weinberger, R., Pratt, R. H., & Levinson, H. S. (2003). Parking Management and Supply. In TCRP Report 95: Traveler Response to Transportation System Changes. Transportation Research Board.

Manville, M., Beata, A., & Shoup, D. (2013). Turning Housing Into Driving: Parking Requirements and Density in Los Angeles and New York. Housing Policy Debate, 23(2), 350-375.

Manville, M., & Pinski, M. (2020). Parking behaviour: Bundled parking and travel behavior in American cities. Land Use Policy, 91(February 2019). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landusepol.2019.02.012

MAPC. (2017). Metro Boston Perfect Fit Parking Initiative: Phase 1 Report (Issue February). Metropolitan Area Planning Council. http://perfectfitparking.mapc.org/

McCahill, C., Garrick, N., & Atkinson-Palombo, C. (2018). The Fiscal and Travel Consequences og Parking Requirements. In D. Shoup (Ed.), Parking and the City (pp. 125-132). Routledge.

McCahill, Chris. (2017). Factors Affecting Residential Parking Occupancy in Madison, Wisconsin. Transportation Research Record: Journal of the Transportation Research Board, 2651, 71–79. https://doi.org/10.3141/2651-08

- McCahill, Chris, Garrick, N., Atkinson-Palombo, C., & Polinski, A. (2016). Effects of Parking Provision on Automobile Use in Cities: Inferring Causality. *Transportation Research Record: Journal of the Transportation Research Board*, 2543, 159–165. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781107415324.004
- Rogers, J., Emerine, D., Haas, P., Jackson, D., Kauffmann, P., Rybeck, R., & Westrom, R. (2016). Estimating Parking Utilization in Multi-Family Residential Buildings in Washington, D.C. Transportation Research Record: Journal of the Transportation Research Board, 2568, 72–82. https://doi.org/10.3141/2568-11
- Rowe, D., McCourt, R. S., Morse, S., & Haas, P. (2013). Do Land Use, Transit, and Walk Access Affect Residential Parking Demand? ITE Journal, February, 24-28.
- Shoup, D. C., & Breinholt, M. J. (1997). Empoyer-Paid Parking: A Nationwide Survey of Employers' Parking Subsidy Policies. In D. L. Greene, D. W. Jones, & M. A. Delucchi (Eds.), *The Full Costs and Benefits of Transportation* (Issue 506, pp. 371–385). Springer.
- Spivak, J. (2018). People Over Parking. Planning. https://www.planning.org/planning/2018/oct/peopleoverparking/
- Stevens, M. R. (2017). Does Compact Development Make People Drive Less? Journal of the American Planning Association, 83(1), 7–18. https://doi.org/10.1080/01944363.2016.1245112
- Weinberger, R. (2012). Death by a thousand curb-cuts: Evidence on the effect of minimum parking requirements on the choice to drive. Transport Policy, 20, 93-102. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tranpol.2011.08.002
- Weinberger, R. R., & Karlin-Resnick, J. (2015). Parking in Mixed-Use U.S. Districts: Oversupplied No Matter How You Slice the Pie. *Transportation Research Record: Journal of the Transportation Research Board*, 2537, 177–184. https://doi.org/10.3141/2537-19

Weinberger, R., Seaman, M., Johnson, C., & Kaehny, J. (2008). Guaranteed Parking - Guaranteed Driving (Issue October). Transportation Alternatives.