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Project Background

• Provision of adequate Affordable Housing is a priority

• Inflexible/outmoded parking requirements contribute to land use inefficiencies, increased costs and bar augmenting the City stock of Affordable Housing

• Direction – Develop parking requirements based a scientific study using local data
Key Project Objectives

1. Evaluate parking demand at local Affordable Housing developments

2. Identify how parking demand is affected by different project and neighborhood characteristics

3. Develop parking requirements for future Affordable Housing projects sensitive to their context
Definition of **Affordable Housing**

- Units with restrictions recorded against the property which determine:
  - Monthly rent
  - Sales price
  - Targeted ownership or rental households
  - Occupancy
  - Length of affordability
Site Selection

Representative Sample

• Several databases of sites from city combined cleaned up & geocoded - 138 sites
• Site selection tool applied to keep existing 138 sites characteristic distribution – 50 sites
  – Project type & size
  – Land use & transit characteristics
  – Geographic distribution
• Site managers contacted for participation in survey – 34 sites
• On/off-site parking data collection conducted – 21 sites
  – Meets original site characteristic distribution
  – Survey response rates >20%
Data Collected

- Project characteristics
  - Unit mix, housing type, project type, parking demand
- Neighborhood context
  - Transit availability, frequency, sidewalks, bike facilities, LU mix
- Resident characteristics
  - Household size, auto ownership, parking habits

Data Source: City of San Diego, SANDAG
Data Collection Methods

- Household Survey (34 sites)
  - 2,780 households
  - 40% return
- Annual Eligibility Survey (income data)
- Field observations of parking patterns (21 sites)
- GIS mapping of transit and land use context
Public Participation Process

- Website Updates:  [www.sandiego.gov/affordpark/](http://www.sandiego.gov/affordpark/)
- Fact Sheets
- Public Workshop
- Focus Groups
- Stakeholder Meetings (PWG)
- Updates to Public Officials
Data Analysis & Findings
Vehicle Availability for AFH Residents

**Average Household Vehicle Availability**

- Survey Respondents: 0.6
- San Diego Rental Units: 1.6

**Distribution of Residents' Household Vehicle Availability**

- 0 Vehicles available: 2%
- 1 Vehicle available: 12%
- 2 Vehicles available: 39%
- 3 Vehicles available: 47%
- 4 Vehicles available: 0%

**Mean Vehicle Availability by Household Income Range**

- $0 - $10,000: 0.5
- $10,001 - $20,000: 1
- $20,001 - $30,000: 1.5
- $30,001 - $40,000: 2
- $40,001+: 2
Vehicle Availability by Housing Type & Unit Size

Large and small family housing have significantly higher average vehicle availability than all other housing types.

Larger units, measured by number of bedrooms, are likely to have
  More residents
  More drivers
  More vehicle availability
Vehicle Availability by Transit & Land Use

Household vehicle availability is higher in areas that are:
- Less conducive to walking
- More limited access to transit.

- Transit use is measured in terms of peak hour rail transit trips within ½ mile and bus transit trips within ¼ mile

- Land use index is based on the number of destinations within ½ mile.

Three Categories
- Suburban: High parking demand propensity
- Urban: Medium parking demand propensity
- Core: Low parking demand propensity
Parking Utilization

Reported vehicle availability was greater than measured overnight occupancy

- On-site parking utilization data indicated parking was less utilized than the household survey responses implied.
- Of households that parked a vehicle – most parked on-site. 35.3% of households indicated they had an one or more assigned spaces.
- Most visitors parked on-street (54.5%); 16.7% parked in designated visitor parking.
Highlights of Study Recommendations

- Rates linked to broad transportation, land use and housing goals
- Rates considered in the context of on-street parking management
- Rates based on housing type and size (Family housing, senior housing, living unit/SRO housing, studio/1 bedroom, special needs)
- Rates consider project characteristics and context (transit availability and walkable destinations).
- Provisions for Visitor and Staff parking.
- Base vacancy factor (10%) adjusted to consider assigned vs. unassigned parking.
- Instituting unassigned parking to optimize on-site supply.
- Parking management tools and travel demand management strategies to be considered for appropriate developments to supplement minimum parking requirements reform.

(Parking pricing/unbundling and tandem parking were found not applicable)
Parking Requirements

Lookup table:

- Type & size of unit (5 types)
- Project characteristics/context (Low/core, Medium/urban or High/suburban parking demand propensity)
- Guest parking on-site (0 or 0.15 spaces per unit)
- Staff parking on-site (0 – 0.1 spaces/unit)
- Vacancy rate (0 or 10%)
## Implementation (example)

### 80 UNIT FAMILY HOUSING EXAMPLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>High Parking Demand Propensity (Suburban Settings)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.Units</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.Rate</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1.0/0.6/0.33</td>
<td>1.3/1.1/0.5</td>
<td>1.75/1.4/0.75</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.1/1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.Spaces</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>54.6</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>112.1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>128.1</td>
<td>141</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Medium Parking Demand Propensity (Urban Settings)** |                |                 |               |               |               |                          |                             |                          |                          |                                          |
| 1.Units        | 80             | 0               | 12            | 42            | 26            |                          |                             |                          |                          |                                          |
| 2.Rate         | N/A            | 1.0/0.6/0.33    | 1.3/1.1/0.5   | 1.75/1.4/0.75 | 0.15          | 0.05                     |                             |                          |                          | 1.1/1.0                    |
| 3.Spaces       | 0              | 7.2             | 46.2          | 36.4          | 89.8          | 12                       | 4                           | 105.8                    | 116                       |

S- Suburban  U- Urban  C - Core
# Base Parking Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit Size</th>
<th>Citywide Parking Ratio&lt;sup&gt;1, 2&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Number of Units</th>
<th>Citywide</th>
<th>Transit Overlay or Very Low Income</th>
<th>Parking Impact</th>
<th>Suburban Settings</th>
<th>Urban Settings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Studio</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 BR</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>12 (15%)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 BR</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>42 (52.5%)</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>73.5</td>
<td>94.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 BR</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>26 (32.5%)</td>
<td>58.5</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Spaces</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>161</strong></td>
<td><strong>141</strong></td>
<td><strong>181</strong></td>
<td><strong>141</strong></td>
<td><strong>116</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>1</sup> 0.25 less for very low income, Transit Overlay, & tandem parking  
<sup>2</sup> 0.25 additional in Parking Impact
Next Steps

• Land Development Code Amendments
• Review Process:
  – Technical Advisory Committee
  – Code monitoring Team
  – Community Planners Committee
  – E-Blast for public review and comment
  – Web posting
• Approval Process:
  – Planning Commission
  – City Council
  – California Coastal Commission
Questions and Answers