



CITY OF GLENDALE CALIFORNIA
REPORT TO CITY COUNCIL AND REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY

February 8, 2011

AGENDA ITEM

Implementation of the Downtown Mobility Study – Amendments to Downtown Parking Standards

- (1) Motion – Council/Agency direction on potential parking amendments in the Downtown Specific Plan area
- (2) Motion – Initiate Code Changes in GMC Chapter 30.32 to amend parking standards in the Downtown Specific Plan area
- (3) Resolution on appropriating \$50,000 from the Redevelopment Fund from the Central Glendale Undesignated Fund balance 25300-240 to the Downtown Development Standards project Account No. 53160-240-701-51288
- (4) Motion to approve change order for Nelson/Nygaard Consultant Associates in the amount of \$50,000 for implementation of the Downtown Mobility Study

COUNCIL ACTION

Public Hearing []	Ordinance []	Consent Calendar []	Action Item [X]	Report Only []
Approved for <u>2/8/11</u>		calendar		

ADMINISTRATIVE ACTION

	Signature
Submitted by	
Hassan Haghani, Director of Community Development	
Steve Zurn, Director of Public Works	
Prepared by	
Michael Nilsson, Mobility Planner	
Approved by	
James E. Starbird, City Manager	
Reviewed by	
Scott H. Howard, City Attorney	
Jano Baghdanian, Traffic and Transportation Administrator	
Emil Tatevosian, Deputy Director of Policy Development	
Alan Loomis, Principal Urban Designer	
Bob Elliot, Director of Finance	
Adriana Escutia, Office Services Supervisor	

RECOMMENDATION

Staff requests the following actions from City Council and the Glendale Redevelopment Agency:

1) Input and direction from the City Council/Redevelopment Agency on the following amendments to parking requirements within the Downtown Specific Plan area to implement the Downtown Mobility Study:

- a) Reduce the minimum parking requirements for commercial and residential uses.
- b) Raise the parking exemption for change-of-use from 2,000 to 5,000 square feet.
- c) Incorporate opportunities to reduce required parking through Transportation Demand Management (TDM) programs and an In-Lieu Fee option.
- d) Additional items of interest raised by members of the City Council and the Redevelopment Agency.

2) Initiate the above amendments into the Glendale Municipal Code, Chapter 30.32 – Parking and Loading Chapter. These code amendments will be presented to the Planning Commission and Transportation and Parking Commission prior to final adoption by Council.

3) Appropriate funds for additional studies, research and implementation of Downtown Parking Standards.

SUMMARY

On November 7, 2006 Council adopted the Downtown Specific Plan (DSP). A mixed-use, urban design plan, it is based on the City's long-term vision for Downtown to be an "exciting, vibrant urban center which provides a wide array of shopping, dining, working, living, entertainment and cultural opportunities within a short walking distance." Additionally, it sets the future blueprint for Glendale by channeling development downtown where growth can be effectively managed.

To support this vision, the Downtown Mobility Study was developed in tandem with the DSP and adopted by City Council in 2007. It includes a set of best practices in transportation policy, making future development and economic growth in downtown possible while minimizing traffic congestion and maintaining a high quality of life. An important component of the Mobility Study is to manage parking through maximizing the current parking supply and availability of parking before constructing new parking, as well as supporting alternative forms of transportation versus single-occupancy vehicular driving.

To expedite the study's implementation, Council/Agency approved a contract with Nelson\Nygaard Consulting Associates on March 25, 2008 to prepare several immediate-term measures. Starting in May 2008, Nelson\Nygaard researched best practices and conducted a peer review of several policies in the Mobility Study. The resulting analysis produced a series of memorandums which were presented at meetings to downtown stakeholders, Commissions and City Council from November 2008 through December 2009. (See Public Participation – Background Section)

From this feedback, Staff provided Council with an update on implementation of the Mobility Study in March 2010. (Exhibit 1) Council voted in support for Nelson\Nygaard to further implement parking management recommendations for the Downtown Specific Plan area. Based on City Council direction, stakeholder feedback, and research Nelson\Nygaard prepared the following parking recommendations for downtown Glendale (Exhibit 2):

- Reduce the minimum requirements for parking as required by the Glendale Municipal Code
- Raise the exemption on parking for change-of-use from 2,000 to 5,000 square feet
- Provide a menu of options to further satisfy code required parking through a set of TDM incentives and an in-lieu fee option

These recommendations were presented to a Joint Meeting of the Transportation and Parking Commission and the Planning Commission on November 17, 2010 and to downtown stakeholders on December 9, 2010 and January 12, 2011. Positive responses to the proposed amendments from both the Commissions and stakeholders were received in these presentations, with general support given to proceed on all the recommendations proposed by Nelson\Nygaard. Below are general comments received by the Commissions and stakeholders:

Areas of Support –

- Raising Parking Exemptions for Change-of-Use businesses from 2,000 to 5,000 square feet.
- The menu of Transportation Demand Management incentives and programs.
- The In-Lieu Fee option.
- Requiring Bicycle Parking in all new developments within the Downtown Specific Plan area.

Areas of Concern –

- Minimum parking requirements are potentially too low for residences if all parking reduction incentives are used – a minimum of one parking space per unit should be established.
- Allowing parking reductions for proximity to transit in a downtown with limited service.
- Potential for spillover parking in adjoining residential neighborhoods.
- To confirm parking demand and available capacity for additional development, a quantitative analysis needs to be conducted to implement recommendations and to realize any additional incentives for downtown.

To accommodate the requests and concerns raised by the Planning Commission and local Stakeholders, Staff recommends drafting code amendments implementing the proposed recommendations with the following revisions/additions –

- Regardless of incentives used, require a minimum of one parking space per residential unit.
- Remove the incentive lowering parking near transit until service is enhanced downtown.
- Support establishing infrastructure to limit spillover into adjacent residential neighborhoods.

The amendments stated above are part of a comprehensive package of parking recommendations to support a multi-use and walkable downtown as stated in the vision of the Downtown Specific Plan. Additional components of this package to be discussed in further detail at future meetings include:

- Establishing focused parking incentives for an Art & Entertainment District downtown.
- Creating a wayfinding program to direct visitors to parking and destinations.
- Creating parking requirements for outdoor dining to support the expansion of this use in downtown, as these standards are not currently provided in the existing zoning code.

To support these parking adjustments, Staff recommends the Council/Agency appropriate funds for Nelson\Nygaard to conduct a parking demand analysis in downtown Glendale. This study will help confirm existing and future parking demand, determine the feasibility for creation of additional parking incentives downtown, and confirm the viability of implementing the complete set of parking recommendations discussed above. These package of recommendations will enable downtown Glendale to realize its vision as a vibrant urban center as stated in the Downtown Specific Plan.

FISCAL IMPACT

The existing Nelson\Nygaard Professional Services Agreement on the Mobility Study Implementation Project (Account No. 53160-240-701-51288) is \$240,000, with the total contract for the Mobility Study totaling \$867,706 since 2006. The remaining balance for this contract is approximately \$30,000.

Additional funds into the Nelson\Nygaard Professional Services Agreement in the amount of \$50,000 will be funded as follows:

Central Glendale Undesignated Fund balance 25300-240 to Account No. 53160-240-701-51288 in the amount of \$50,000 for a parking demand analysis of the Downtown Specific Area.

BACKGROUND

Vision for Downtown Glendale – Downtown Specific Plan and Mobility Study

On November 7, 2006 Council adopted the Downtown Specific Plan (DSP). A mixed-use, urban design plan, it is based on the City's long-term vision for Downtown to be an "exciting, vibrant urban center which provides a wide array of shopping, dining, working, living, entertainment and cultural opportunities within a short walking distance." It sets the future blueprint for Glendale by channeling development in downtown where growth can be effectively managed.

To support this vision, the Downtown Mobility Study was developed in tandem with the DSP and adopted by City Council in 2007. It outlines the package of best practices in transportation policy for making future development and economic growth in downtown possible while minimizing traffic congestion and maintaining a high quality of life. The following are the main policy concepts in the Mobility Study:

- **Street Types:** designate pedestrian-priority, transit-priority and vehicular-priority streets, with an overall emphasis of moving people versus cars through downtown Glendale.
- **Street Capacity Enhancements:** limit future road widening in downtown to Central Avenue, Colorado Street and Glendale Avenue.
- **Transit Service:** support transit infrastructure to maximize ridership downtown.
- **Parking Management:** maximize the current parking supply and availability of parking before constructing new parking.
- **Transportation Demand Management:** incentivize and support alternative forms of transportation versus single-occupancy vehicular driving.
- **Funding and Financing:** first create locally-generated financing mechanisms to pay for mobility improvements, then seek federal and state financing to pay for large-scale projects.

Background Research Conducted for Policy Implementation

Also included in the Mobility Study is an action plan of immediate, near-term, medium-term and long term actions to implement its policy recommendations. To expedite implementation, Council/ Agency approved a contract with Nelson\Nygaard on March 25, 2008 to prepare several immediate-term measures. Since then, Nelson\Nygaard has conducted a peer review and researched best practices to implement policies in the Parking Management Chapter of the Mobility Study.

The resulting analysis produced a series of memorandums which were presented at meetings to downtown stakeholders, Commissions and City Council from November 2008 through December 2009. (See Public Participation) From this feedback, Staff provided Council with an update on implementation of the Mobility Study in March 2010. (Exhibit 1) Council voted in support for

Nelson\Nygaard to further implement parking management recommendations for the Downtown Specific Plan area. Based on City Council direction, stakeholder feedback, and research Nelson\Nygaard prepared a set of specific recommendations for downtown Glendale.

Amendments to parking requirements in the Downtown Specific Plan area include the following components:

- Reduce the minimum requirements for parking as required by the Glendale Municipal Code
- Raise the exemption on parking for change-of-use from 2,000 to 5,000 square feet
- Provide a menu of options to further satisfy code required parking through a set of TDM incentives and an in-lieu fee option

Public Participation between 2008 and 2010

Downtown Stakeholders have been invited to a series of meetings to review and discuss parking management policies as described above as recommended by Nelson\Nygaard. Nelson\Nygaard and City Staff met with the following stakeholders from November 2008 through March 2009:

- Downtown Merchants Association – November 19, 2008
- Glendale Transportation Management Association and Glendale Chamber of Commerce – December 1, 2008
- Downtown Glendale developers, property managers and realtors – January 12, 2009 and March 19, 2009

In addition to meeting with stakeholders, the following public meetings were conducted with City Council and the Transportation and Parking Commission:

- Study Session with City Council – October 21, 2008
- Review of Multi-Family Parking Recommendations with the Transportation and Parking Commission – December 8, 2009
- Update on Mobility Study Implementation to City Council – March 9, 2010

On March 9, 2010, the Agency/Council directed Nelson\Nygaard and City Staff to refine their initial recommendations. Revisions included a menu-based system to satisfy parking requirements with several TDM-based incentives and an in-lieu fee option. In addition, minimum parking requirements in downtown were analyzed in further detail based on existing parking demand and a peer review of parking requirements in adjacent jurisdictions.

November 17, 2010 Presentation to the Planning Commission and Transportation & Parking Commission

On November 17, 2010, final draft recommendations were presented to the Planning Commission and Transportation and Parking Commission in a joint meeting. In addition to the presentation of specific recommendations for the Downtown Specific Plan area (Exhibit 2), the members of the Commission had the opportunity to review the ten background memorandums of peer research produced by Nelson\Nygaard from 2008-2010.

In addition to the required public notice, representatives from the Downtown Merchant's Association, Glendale Chamber of Commerce, Glendale Transportation Management Association, and local developer, realtor and property management representatives were informed of the meeting. The members of both Commissions were asked to give input and direction on the following recommendations:

- 1) Reduce the minimum parking requirements for commercial and residential uses.
- 2) Raise the parking exemption for change-of-use from 2,000 to 5,000 square feet.
- 3) Incorporate opportunities to reduce required parking through Transportation Demand Management (TDM) programs and an In-Lieu Fee option.
- 4) Additional items of interest raised by members of the Planning Commission and members of the Transportation and Parking Commission.

Members of the Transportation and Parking Commission and Planning Commission were generally supportive of all the proposed amendments to parking within the Downtown Specific Area. Below are comments that were received from the commissioners at the meeting:

Areas of Support

- Raising the parking exception from 2,000 to 5,000 square feet for change-of-use of commercial businesses in the Downtown Specific Plan area.
- Transportation Demand Management Programs and membership in the Transportation Management Association is universally supported and should be mandatory for businesses in the Downtown Specific Plan area if amendments are implemented.
- In-Lieu Fee option is supported, but the fee recommendation should be set at a higher rate than proposed to sufficiently cover the cost of constructing parking.

Areas of Concern

- If parking requirements are lowered, then downtown policies and infrastructure need to be in place to limit spillover parking from commercial uses.
- Require a minimum of one parking space per unit for residential uses, regardless of the number of parking incentives used. The current formula allows developers to go under that threshold.
- Modify or remove the incentive to allow parking reductions based on proximity to transit due to limited transit facilities and service in downtown Glendale.
- Justify amendments to parking requirements through providing a quantitative analysis of parking demand for downtown to verify that reductions will not result in parking shortages.

Meetings with Downtown Stakeholders – December 9, 2010 and January 12, 2011

A variety of stakeholders in downtown Glendale were invited to an open house on potential incentives downtown December 9, 2010 as well as a specific presentation with Nelson\Nygaard on Downtown Parking Amendments on January 12, 2011. A digital copy of the parking recommendations were provided to meeting attendees in advance of the January 12, 2011 meeting. (Exhibit 1) Over 20 people were in attendance at both meetings, including representatives from the Downtown Merchant's Association, Glendale Chamber of Commerce, The Americana at Brand, Glendale Galleria, small business owners and local realtors, property managers and developers. Overall, participants were supportive of the proposal. The participants had the following specific input in regards to the recommendations proposed:

Areas of Support

- General support for lowering all the parking minimums as recommended, as long as residential units do not go under one parking space per unit.
- Raising the parking exception from 2,000 to 5,000 square feet for change-of-use of commercial businesses is encouraged – with additional support to raise the square foot exemption higher.
- Bicycle Parking Requirement universally supported, with further support to improve bicycle infrastructure within downtown.

- The flexibility and variety of incentives proposed to satisfy parking requirements were universally supported.

Areas of Concern

- Supported Transportation Demand Management parking incentives, but were concerned about the mandatory requirement for businesses and developments to join a Transportation Management Association.
- Some participants stated parking minimums are not being lowered enough; the City should conduct a quantitative analysis of downtown land uses that assesses current parking demand to verify that additional parking incentives can be explored or existing incentives expanded.
- Concern about potential spillover parking in adjoining residential neighborhoods.

Results of Feedback, Additional Studies Requested and Recommendations

As a result of input and comments received by members of the Planning Commission, members of the Transportation and Parking Commission, and downtown Stakeholders, Staff recommends that the City Council initiate code changes to amend Chapter 30.32 of the Glendale Municipal Code with the following recommended revisions –

- Set parking minimums to one parking space per residential unit due to comments received by officials and stakeholders.
- Remove the reduction of parking based on proximity to transit due to existing limitations in transit service.
- Support infrastructure that limit the effects of spillover parking through establishing a wayfinding program to parking resources.

In addition, the parking amendments described in this report are part of a comprehensive package to modify parking management policies in downtown Glendale, all of which implement the vision stated in the Downtown Specific Plan. Additional programs to be presented in further detail at a later date include:

- Creating a wayfinding program to direct visitors to downtown parking and destinations.
- Adding parking standards for outdoor dining uses to support the expansion of outdoor dining within downtown, as there are no current standards mentioned in the existing zoning code.
- Focused parking incentives for uses that support implementing and enhancing the vision of downtown Glendale, such the proposed Art & Entertainment District

To ensure that the amendments proposed for the overall downtown area and the complete package of parking management proposals will not endanger the quality of life and existing available supply of parking downtown, Staff recommends the City conduct a demand analysis of parking for downtown through Nelson\Nygaard. As the City of Glendale implements parking management recommendations in the Downtown Mobility Study, comments and concerns from officials, residents and stakeholders have been received in regards to the approximate parking demand and amount of development that downtown Glendale can absorb. Assessing existing occupancy and projecting an estimated parking demand for future land uses will enable the City to determine the possibilities of additional incentives as supported in the Downtown Specific Plan and Mobility Study to further realize the vision of a vibrant, multi-use and walkable downtown.

Next Steps

Below are the anticipated next steps for the proposed amendments of parking requirements for the Downtown Specific Plan Area:

- Prepare ordinance language to amend Chapter 30.32 in the City of Glendale Municipal Code
- Prepare a parking study within Downtown Glendale to assess concerns raised in outreach meetings and to verify existing parking supply and demand
- Present draft ordinance to the Planning Commission and the Transportation and Parking Commission
- Submit final ordinance to City Council for approval

It is anticipated that adjustments to the parking code for the Downtown Specific Area will be submitted to the Planning Commission and the Transportation and Parking Commission for an advisory recommendation in late February 2010 prior to City Council consideration of final approval in late March 2011. This timeline may be adjusted based on feedback received from stakeholders, Commissioners and Council members.

EXHIBITS

Exhibit 1 – Mobility Study Implementation – Status Chart

Exhibit 2 – Glendale Downtown Specific Plan Parking Recommendations

MOTION

Moved by Council Member _____, seconded by Council Member _____, that with regard to the Downtown Specific Plan Area and consideration of possible parking amendments council hereby directs staff to begin the process for amending Chapter 30.32 of the Glendale Municipal Code to: (a) reduce minimum parking requirements for commercial and residential uses; (b) raise the parking exemption for change-of-use from 2,000 to 5,000 square feet; (c) incorporate opportunities to reduce required parking through Transportation Demand Management (TDM) programs and an In-Lieu Fee option. Council further directs staff as follows:


Vote as follows:

Ayes:

Noes:

Absent:

Abstain:

APPROVED AS TO FORM

CITY CLERK
2-2-11

MOTION

Moved by Council Member _____,
seconded by Council Member _____, that
the Council hereby approves a change order to the professional
services agreement for Nelson/Nygaard Consulting Associates, for
the Mobility Study Implementation Project in an amount not to
exceed \$50,000.00 as outlined in the staff report re:
Implementation of the Downtown Mobility Study-Amendments to
Downtown Parking Standards. The City Manager is hereby
authorized to execute such change order subject to approval by
the City Attorney.


Vote as follows:

Ayes:

Noes:

Absent:

Abstain:



2-2-11

MOTION

Moved by Agency Member _____,
seconded by Agency Member _____, that
the Redevelopment Agency hereby approves a change order to the
professional services agreement for Nelson/Nygaard Consulting
Associates, for the Mobility Study Implementation Project in an
amount not to exceed \$50,000.00 as outlined in the staff report
re: Implementation of the Downtown Mobility Study-Amendments
to Downtown Parking Standards. The Executive Director is hereby
authorized to execute such change order subject to approval by
the City Attorney.

Vote as follows:

Ayes:

Noes:

Absent:

Abstain:



2-2-11

RESOLUTION NO. _____

**RESOLUTION OF THE GLENDALE REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY
MAKING AN APPROPRIATION**

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE GLENDALE REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY:

SECTION 1: That the sum of \$50,000 is hereby appropriated and/or transferred from the following accounts:

ACCOUNTS	DESCRIPTION	FROM	TO
25300-240	GRA Administrative Fund I, Undesignated Fund Balance	\$50,000	
53160-240-701-51288	GRA Administrative Fund I, Planning, Survey, and Design, Downtown Development Standards		\$50,000

To appropriate funding from the GRA Administrative Fund I undesignated fund balance for a parking demand analysis of the Downtown Specific Area.

SECTION 2: The Director of Finance is authorized to make such other revisions, individual appropriation line-items, changes in summaries, fund totals, grand totals, and other portions of the budget document as necessary to reflect and implement the changes specified in this resolution.

SECTION 3: The Secretary shall certify to the adoption of this Resolution.

Adopted this _____ day of _____ 2011.

ATTEST:

Secretary



Chairperson
CITY OF GLENDALE
DATE 1-26-2011
APPROVED AS TO FINANCIAL
PROVISION FOR \$ 50,000.-

Robert Elter

Director of Finance

STATE OF CALIFORNIA)
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES) SS
CITY OF GLENDALE)

I, Ardashes Kassakhian, Secretary of the Glendale Redevelopment Agency, do hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution No. _____ was adopted by the Glendale Redevelopment Agency of the City of Glendale, California, at a regular meeting held on the _____ day of _____, 2011, and that the same was adopted by the following vote:

Ayes:
Noes:
Absent:

[Signature]
CITY ATTORNEY
2-2-11

Secretary **3 0**

Progress on Implementation of the Mobility Study

As of February 8, 2011

Immediate Term Action Items as outlined in Chapter 8 of the Mobility Study

Policy #	Policy Recommendation in the Mobility Study	Task not started	Task Initiated	Task Completed	Notes on Implementation Progress
Chapter 2 - Street Typology					
2.1a	Support and promote programs and projects that enhance Downtown's access via regional transit.		X		*Support and Coordination with Metro on Metro bus routes and studies such as the East-West Corridor.
2.1b	Implement program for adjusting local/ regional transit services to meet performance criteria for the Primary Transit Network.		X		*Dan Boyle and Associates selected in Fall 2008 to conduct the Beeline Line-by-Line Analysis. *Line-by-Line Analysis report prepared and findings, including route and fare recommendations presented to TPC in September 2009. Recommendations to be refined based on new fiscal year budget for 2010-2011.
2.3	Adopt the recommended Downtown Street Typology to provide clearer policy guidance for future decisions on street design and operation.		X		*Recent developments in the Downtown Specific Plan and street improvement projects have followed the Mobility Study's recommendations on downtown street typology.
2.4a	Use auto performance measures as a guide for Downtown streets to focus on optimizing the person-carrying capacity of streets rather than vehicle-carrying capacity.	X			*Alternative Level-of-Service measures have not been discussed or adopted in Glendale at this time. The City of Seattle is in progress of developing alternative measures to measure the carrying capacity of roads.
2.4b	Use transit performance measures as a guide for Downtown streets, with new indicator: Transit Quality and Level of Service.	X			*Alternative Level-of-Service measures have not been discussed or adopted in Glendale at this time. The City of Seattle is in progress of developing alternative measures to measure the carrying capacity of roads.
2.4c	Use pedestrian and bicycle performance measures as a guide for the design and operation of Downtown streets.		X		*Through the PLACE Grant, Bicycle and Pedestrian Counts were conducted throughout the City of Glendale in September 2009 and September 2010 are projected to be completed on a year-to-year basis.
Chapter 3 - Street Capacity Enhancements					
3.1a	Develop and submit to Council a plan to implement the street capacity enhancement improvements not requiring the acquisition of rights-of-way identified in Appendix A of the DSP no later than July 1, 2007.		X - Central Avenue	X - Colorado Street	*Colorado Boulevard Widening project from Brand Boulevard to Glendale Avenue completed in November 2009. *Central Avenue Rehabilitation Project Kickoff February 2010 - street improvement project is in process.

Policy #	Policy Recommendation in the Mobility Study	Task not started	Task Initiated	Task Completed	Notes on Implementation Progress
Chapter 4- Transit Service					
4.1	Market the transit resources in Glendale as a single system.	X			
4.2a & 4.3	Create a free downtown shuttle; should connect regional transit and key downtown destinations. Begin service within existing resources. Operate shuttle as frequently as possible with unique and attractive vehicle.		X		*Investigated as an option in the recent Beeline Line-by-Line Analysis. Potential ridership of the line as well as costs to administer the shuttle were investigated. Results will be presented to Council in Spring 2010.
4.4	Implement recommendations of Short Range Transit Plan including service and capital improvements that affect downtown.		X		*Funding for a new Glendale Beeline bus facility at the Glendale Transportation Center is in progress.
4.6	Consolidate high frequency services transit on a limited number of transit priority streets; optimize these for transit operation.	X			
4.9	Create amenity standards for downtown transit stops. Maximize amenities including signage and other amenities along shuttle route and other transit priority streets.			X	*Bus Shelters and next bus equipment acquired and installed along Brand Boulevard in July 2008.
4.11	Consider utilizing new parking revenue to enhance shuttle and other transit services.		X		*Recommended as a potential policy solution requiring major changes from existing policy at the Dec 7th, 2009 TPC hearing on Multi-Family Parking Issues.
4.13	Develop performance standards for transit streets that incorporate transit quality of service, and go beyond auto level of service.	X			*Alternative Level-of-Service measures have not been discussed or adopted in Glendale at this time. The City of Seattle is in progress of developing alternative measures to measure the carrying capacity of roads.
Chapter 5 - Parking Management					
5.1	Create a "Park Once" district in Downtown Glendale by managing public parking as an integrated system.		X		*Parking rates and hours were adjusted downtown in November 2008. Downtown Wayfinding Program launched on October 27, 2009, coordinated with Citywide Marketing and Branding Strategy. Wayfinding concept to be presented to Council in February 2011.
5.2	Implement coordinated parking management policies for on- and off-street parking using demand-responsive pricing to promote parking goals of 85% occupancy and turnover of short term spaces.			X	*Pay-by-Space Parking Meters on Brand Boulevard purchased by the City in July 2008. *Meters installed in October 2008, have been operational since November 2008. *Parking Pricing System implemented downtown on November 2008. *Time limits for Parking Lot 6 revised on July 2009.

Policy #	Policy Recommendation in the Mobility Study	Task not started	Task Initiated	Task Completed	Notes on Implementation Progress
Chapter 5 - Parking Management					
5.4	Implement a multi-modal transportation and parking wayfinding system, including information on parking direction location, pricing, and real-time parking occupancy.		X		*Consultant selected to design updated parking signs and wayfinding signs downtown. Council approval occurred on October 27th, 2009. *Metro Call for Projects Grant awarded for Digital Wayfinding Signs in downtown Glendale and major freeway exits in Fall 2009. Concept to be presented to Council in February 2011. Implementation likely to occur in mid-late 2011.
5.5	Install networked multi-space pay stations and occupancy sensors.			X	*Pay-by-Space Parking Meters on Brand Boulevard purchased by the City in July 2008. *Meters installed in October 2008, have been operational since November 2008.
5.7a	Create a Downtown Transportation and Parking Management District managed by the Traffic and Transportation Administrator or their delegate in a newly-hired Downtown Mobility Coordinator.		X		*Recommended as a potential policy solution requiring major changes from existing policy at the Dec 7th, 2009 TPC hearing on Multi-Family Parking Issues. Comprehensive Parking Solutions launched for the South Brand Neighborhood - update to progress to be presented to Council in February 2011.
5.7b	Dedicate all parking revenue to a Downtown Transportation Fund to be invested in transportation and streetscape improvements.		X		*Introduction as a potential ordinance occurred in the October 21st City Council Study Session. *Discussed at outreach meetings with local organizations in November 2008, December 2008, January 2009 and March 2009 *Recommended as a potential policy solution requiring moderate changes from existing policy at the Dec 7th, 2009 TPC hearing on Multi-Family Parking Issues.
5.12	Consider implementing a traffic congestion development impact fee based on estimated number of PM peak hour auto trips.		X		*Introduced as a potential financing mechanism to fund Mobility Projects in the March 9th, 2010 Mobility Implementation Progress Staff Report.
5.13	Allow new downtown development to reduce its "parking footprint" by legalizing more efficient parking arrangements in order to facilitate better ground-floor urban design.		X		*Recommended as a potential policy solution requiring major changes from existing policy at the Dec 7th, 2009 TPC hearing on Multi-Family Parking Issues. Recommended as one of the amendments to the parking code for the Downtown Specific Plan area - to be presented to Council in February 2011.
5.14	Expand existing provisions in zoning code that allow new development to go below existing parking minimums, under very specific conditions.		X		*Introduced as a strategy to allow developers in downtown to build less parking (providing an In-Lieu Fee) than what is required per the existing code in the March 9th, 2010 Staff Report. Recommended as one of the amendments to the parking code for the DSP area - to be presented to Council in February 2011.
5.15	Prevent spillover parking as needed reforming existing Parking Preferential Program and converting into Residential Parking Benefit Districts.		X		*Recommended as a potential policy solution requiring major changes from existing policy at the Dec 7th, 2009 TPC hearing on Multi-Family Parking Issues. *January 2010 TPC Hearing advocated further study on Preferential Parking Districts, including district-based parking. *Studies on the feasibility of District-based parking districts to start February 2010.

Policy #	Policy Recommendation in the Mobility Study	Task not started	Task Initiated	Task Completed	Notes on Implementation Progress
Chapter 6 - Transportation Demand Management					
6.1	Adopt a new strengthened TDM ordinance including mandatory TMA membership and TDM programs.		X		*Introduced strengthened ordinance - Study Session on October 21st, 2008 *Discussed at outreach meetings in November 2008 - March 2009 *Recommended as a potential policy solution requiring moderate changes from existing policy at the Dec 7th, 2009 TPC hearing on Multi-Family Parking Issues. *Included as a policy recommendation for parking code amendments in the DSP area - February 8, 2011.
6.7	Strengthen the existing Glendale Transportation Management Associates (TMA) and define roles and responsibilities between the TMA and the City.		X		*Introduced strengthened ordinance - Study Session on October 21st, 2008 *Discussed at outreach meetings in November 2008 - March 2009 *Recommended as a potential policy solution requiring moderate changes from existing policy at the Dec 7th, 2009 TPC hearing on Multi-Family Parking Issues. *Included as a policy recommendation for parking code amendments in the DSP area - February 8, 2011.
Chapter 7 - Funding and Financing					
7.1	Maximize utilization of new parking revenue to fund Downtown Mobility Study recommendations by broadening eligible uses of parking funds to include a broad range of Downtown Mobility Study recommendations.		X		*Introduced Downtown Mobility Fund ordinance - City Council Study Session on October 21st, 2008 *Discussed at outreach meetings with local organizations in November 2008, December 2008, January 2009 and March 2009 *Recommended as a potential policy solution requiring moderate changes from existing policy at the Dec 7th, 2009 TPC hearing on Multi-Family Parking Issues.
7.4a	Work with downtown stakeholders to investigate formation of a downtown Business Improvement District (BID) or a Mello-Roos District.		X		*Study to form a Downtown Business Improvement District presented to Council and approved by Council on October 27th, 2009.
7.5a	Initiate a transportation impact fee nexus study to mitigate auto trips and congestion impacts of new development.	X			*Task to start if Council has interest in implementing a transportation impact fee as part of the funding and financing strategy to implement Mobility-related projects.
7.8	Work with local and regional transportation leaders to position transportation projects recommended by the Downtown Mobility Study to be eligible for funding under the state transportation bond package.	X			

Progress on Implementation of the Mobility Study

As of February 8, 2011

Short Term Action Items as outlined in Chapter 8 of the Mobility Study

Policy #	Policy Recommendation in the Mobility Study	Task not started	Task Initiated	Task Completed	Notes on Implementation Progress
Chapter 2 - Street Typology					
2.2	Create a Downtown Streetscape Plan, consistent with this Downtown Mobility Study to guide improvements such as enhanced lighting, street landscaping, crosswalks, and signage.	X			*Streetscape improvements consistent with the Downtown Mobility Study have occurred through individual development projects within the Downtown Specific Plan Area as well as improvements to Colorado Boulevard. Improvements to streetscape are currently in progress on Central Avenue.
Chapter 3- Street Capacity Enhancements					
3.1b	Implement a street capacity enhancement and freeway access improvement program for improvements not requiring acquisition of rights-of-way no later than Dec. 31, 2010 .		X		
Chapter 4 - Transit Service					
4.5	Bring transit fares closer together: ≥ \$0.50 on Beeline. Negotiate with MTA for a local Glendale fare.		X		*Line-by-Line Analysis report prepared fare recommendations - presented to TPC in September 2009. Recommendations to be refined based on new fiscal year budget for 2010-2011.
4.7	Signal priority and operational enhancements on streets with 10 minute frequency at peak periods.	X			
4.8	Work with MTA for "east-west" connector service with convenient connections to downtown shuttle.		X		*An East-West Corridor Study was drafted by Metro, investigating the feasibility of transit and/or bus lines through the corridor.
4.10	Incorporate real time information in all high amenity bus shelters using Next Bus technology.			X	*Next bus information incorporated into all recently installed Brand Boulevard bus shelters. Operational since 2009.
4.12	Provide Universal Transit Passes to residents of all new downtown development.	X			*One of the potential programs that can be funded by an enhanced TDM Ordinance. A proposal for a strengthened TDM Ordinance has been introduced to Council at a Study Session on October 21, 2008 as well as to the TPC on December 7, 2009.

Policy #	Policy Recommendation in the Mobility Study	Task not started	Task Initiated	Task Completed	Notes on Implementation Progress
Chapter 5 - Parking Management					
5.3	Implement parking pricing system for Glendale Transportation Center (train riders park free all day, all others pay).			X	*Parking pricing system for the GTC introduced to City Council on December 2007. City Council approved and parking pricing system has been implemented.
5.6	Continue protocols that dedicate adequate parking spaces throughout downtown for loading zones, taxi stands, and ADA-accessible parking.			X	*Parking spaces throughout downtown have been dedicated for loading zones, taxi stands and ADA-accessible parking since approval of the Downtown Specific Plan and the Downtown Mobility Study.
5.8	Authorize Traffic and Transportation Administrator to adjust parking rates, hours, and time limits over time to achieve 85% occupancy.	X			
5.9	Pursue study of single valet parking operator for all of downtown valet parking events.	X			
Chapter 6 - Transportation Demand Management					
6.2a	Create a Universal Transit Pass Program for the Glendale Beeline by negotiating a deep bulk discount for both residents and employees.	X			*One of the potential programs that can be funded by an enhanced TDM Ordinance. A proposal for a strengthened TDM Ordinance has been introduced to Council at a Study Session on October 21, 2008 as well as to the TPC on December 7, 2009.
6.2b	Require employers to provide Beeline passes to all new and existing downtown employees as part of TMA membership.	X			See Note on Recommendation 6.2a
6.2d	Negotiate with the MTA for a deeper discount on universal transit pass cost. Require MTA passes to be provided to all downtown employees and residents, funded by the same mechanisms described above for Beeline passes.	X			See Note on Recommendation 6.2a
6.3a	Begin an education/ enforcement program for existing state parking cash-out law.	X			See Note on Recommendation 6.2a

Policy #	Policy Recommendation in the Mobility Study	Task not started	Task Initiated	Task Completed	Notes on Implementation Progress
Chapter 6 - Transportation Demand Management					
6.3b	Adopt an expanded parking cash-out law for all downtown employers.	X			See Note on Recommendation 6.2a
6.3c	Formalize annual compliance reporting, monitoring, and enforcement program for local cash-out requirements	X			See Note on Recommendation 6.2a
6.4	Revise development standards to include bicycle facility requirements for new downtown development.	X			See Note on Recommendation 6.2a
6.5	Encourage car-sharing by converting city fleet to car-sharing program and/or directly subsidize start-up costs of an existing car share provider.	X			See Note on Recommendation 6.2a
6.6	Establish Downtown Transportation Resource Center managed by Traffic and Transportation or their delegate.	X			See Note on Recommendation 6.2a
Chapter 7 - Funding and Financing					
7.3	Pursue implementation of a gross receipts parking tax on commercial parking.	X			
7.4b	Implement Business Improvement District (BID) or Mello-Roos District. Once implemented, work with the District to advance public/private funding of significant streetscape capital projects or long-term transit capital projects.		X		*Study to form a Downtown Business Improvement District presented to Council and approved by Council on October 27th, 2009.
7.5b	If traffic impact fee nexus study finds a nexus, (per Rec. 7.5a), implement an impact fee for new downtown development. Dedicate fee revenues to a Downtown Transportation Fund.	X			

Policy #	Policy Recommendation in the Mobility Study	Task not started	Task Initiated	Task Completed	Notes on Implementation Progress
Chapter 7 - Funding and Financing					
7.6	Increase transit service to schools via a cost-share arrangement between City and School District and/or a Universal School Transit Pass program.	X			*See Recommendation 6.2a
7.7	Position new projects to receive federal, state, and regional grant funds and change budget process to recognize grant funds as revenue.				*Received the following grants since adoption of the Mobility Study - 1) Metro Call for Projects - Digital Wayfinding Grant 2) New buses for Beeline System 3) Public-Private Partnership for constructing/operating a Compressed Natural Gas Fueling Facility 4) Safe Routes to School Grant 5) Economic Stimulus Projects for Road/Infrastructure Improvements to incorporate bike/pedestrian elements Citywide
7.9	Apply for state grants like Safe Routes to Schools.				*Received Safe Routes to School Grants starting in August 2009. The Traffic/Transportation Division is currently working with Ryan Snyder and Associates to implement grant. At this point time, approximately twelve schools in the Glendale Unified School District have received Safe Routes to School grant funding.
7.11	Work with Congressional delegation to secure federal funding for large-scale capital projects in the next transportation bill (2009).				

Progress on Implementation of the Mobility Study

As of February 8, 2011

Medium and Long Term Action Items as outlined in Chapter 8 of the Mobility Study

Medium Term Action Items

Policy #	Policy Recommendation in the Mobility Study	Task Not Started	Task Initiated	Task Completed	Notes on Implementation Progress
Chapter 5 - Parking Management					
5.16	If and when total demand cannot be met with existing supply, build new public shared parking.	X			
Chapter 6 - Transportation Demand Management					
6.8	Monitor effectiveness of existing and new TDM programs; implement new measures as needed.	X			
Chapter 7 - Funding and Financing					
7.1	Work to make Mobility Study projects a priority in the next update of the Regional Transportation Plan.	X			
<i>Long Term Action Items</i>					
Chapter 4 - Transit Service					
4.2c	Implement a new technology for shuttle and other lines.	X			

MEMORANDUM

To: Mike Nilsson
From: Bonnie Nelson and Phil Olmstead
Date: October 1, 2010
Subject: Glendale Downtown Specific Plan Parking Recommendations

Introduction

This memorandum represents the result of over a year of work with City staff and stakeholders to develop a comprehensive set of parking reforms for Glendale's Downtown Specific Plan (DSP) area. These reforms are intended to balance the need for the economic vitality of the downtown, the experiences of those who work, shop and live downtown, and the need for mobility to, through, and within downtown for a variety of travelers. The parking reforms center on common sense changes to the existing parking code, combined with a toolkit of incentives to encourage smart growth development in the downtown core.

This memorandum first provides a brief history of the extensive work done on Glendale parking issues in recent years and gives a list of the documents previously sent to the City. Second, this memorandum gives an overview of the goals and rationale behind the proposed recommendations. Finally, this memorandum outlines a number of parking recommendations which are designed to work together to help the City solve its parking inefficiencies related to minimum parking requirements.

Background

In 2006 Nelson\Nygaard Consulting Associates, in collaboration with City staff, completed the City of Glendale *Downtown Mobility Study*. The *Downtown Mobility Study* provided a series of recommendations designed to manage traffic congestion, to encourage the use of alternative modes, and to support the *Downtown Specific Plan* goal of creating a multimodal and pedestrian-oriented downtown district. The recommendations and implementation plan that emerged from the *Downtown Mobility Study* sought to address existing needs and future demand for improved access and circulation within downtown Glendale.

One of the key components of the *Mobility Study* was parking management. An analysis of existing parking conditions in the downtown area revealed that current policies, requirements, and regulations had created a number of parking inefficiencies in the downtown area, such as: localized parking shortages, parking spillover into residential areas, "cruising" for unregulated and free parking, underutilized off-street parking garages, and parking permit programs that did not effectively manage demand for on-street spaces.

In the years since the *Downtown Mobility Plan* was finalized, the City of Glendale has taken steps to implement some of the recommendations from that plan. The first, and most significant, initiative included the implementation of pay station meters on Brand Boulevard and in the surface parking lots serving Brand Boulevard businesses, thereby coordinating the pricing structures for both on-street spaces and off-street garages. The goal of these changes was to increase availability of parking on Brand Boulevard for customers of local businesses, while continuing to allow for free or low cost parking in garages where there was low demand. These actions have been a success, enabling the City to reduce "cruising" in the Brand Boulevard corridor, raise additional revenue, and begin to more efficiently manage its overall parking supply.

At the same time, many of the parking recommendations in the *Downtown Mobility Study* were not immediately implemented, and have since undergone additional study and refinement. Nelson\Nygaard has continued to work with City staff to develop and implement changes to existing parking policies and programs, and has produced a series of memos related to various parking issues.¹ In addition, Nelson\Nygaard has been working with the City to conduct a separate study of parking conditions in the South Brand Boulevard corridor, and recently completed a draft existing conditions analysis. A list of these documents is provided below:

- "Countywide Congestion Mitigation Fee" – June 23, 2008
- "Policy Considerations for TDM Ordinance REVISED" – August 8, 2008
- "In-Lieu Parking Fee" – August 12, 2008
- "DRAFT TDM Ordinance" – August 25, 2008
- "Downtown Transportation Fund" – September 19, 2008
- "Downtown Transportation Fund Planning and Implementation" – January 4, 2010
- "Relationship Between TDM and Parking Demand" – April 2, 2010
- "City of Glendale Parking Requirements – Peer Review" – May 5, 2010
- "City of Glendale – Preferential Parking District Program Peer Review" – May 19, 2010
- "Mixed-Use District Parking Requirements – Best Practices" – August 4, 2010
- "South Brand Boulevard Corridor Parking Study – Draft Existing Conditions Analysis" – August 2010

All of these documents have analyzed a particular aspect of parking in the City of Glendale and have incorporated extensive peer reviews and "best practices" research to develop appropriate recommendations for the City. It is not the intent of this memorandum to revisit the detailed findings from each of these memos and studies, but rather to synthesize their recommendations, particularly as they relate to revisions to the City's minimum parking requirements. For more detailed information, it is recommended that City staff review each memo or study individually.

Parking Management Goals

Parking requirements impact much more than the number of vehicles that can be stored on a particular site. Parking requirements can determine the viability of a proposed new development, whether an existing building may be reused, how visitors and employees will access and experience downtown, and, ultimately, whether quality development will occur at all. The following specific goals, developed throughout the planning process for Glendale, have served as a guiding framework for these recommendations:

- Utilize parking management best practices as a tool to coordinate the entire parking supply as part of an integrated system.

¹ In relation to minimum parking requirements, the May 5th and August 4th memos are particularly relevant.

- Manage parking facilities with a focus on maintaining availability, not simply increasing supply.
- Optimize investment in parking by making the most efficient use of all public and private parking facilities, before constructing new parking.
- Improve the coordination of Glendale's on-street and off-street parking policies, so that parking garages are not underutilized, while on-street parking shortages persist.
- Encourage economic revitalization of downtown and remove barriers to development and adaptive reuse projects by adopting parking standards that are tailored to the unique parking demand of mixed use, walkable downtowns.
- Create regulatory certainty for developers as a means to improve economic feasibility and encourage targeted development.
- Improve the quality of life for local residents by reducing congestion, vehicle emissions, and traffic conflicts related to parking inefficiencies.
- Maximize the use of valuable yet scarce street space at all times of the day.

The recommendations included in this memorandum are intended to reinforce these goals and better position the City to achieve its vision for a multimodal and pedestrian-oriented downtown.

Recommended Revisions to Parking Requirements

The recommendations included below are designed to work together to meet Glendale's parking management goals. While these recommendations could theoretically be implemented piece by piece, their effectiveness can only be ensured if they are implemented together. The recommendations are based on sensible adjustments to the City's parking requirements, supplemented by a menu of options that can further adjust parking requirements based on proven performance standards.

1. Avoid a complete overall of the minimum parking requirements, but implement targeted reductions within the DSP zone.

Previous analysis has shown that the minimum parking requirements for the land uses outlined below are artificially high, compared with local and best practice peers, and verified by actual demand in the City of Glendale. Adjusting these requirements will keep Glendale in line with peer cities making it an attractive city for new smart growth development. Recommendations are for the DSP area, where mixed use and higher density development is likely to occur, multimodal access options are available, and demand management techniques are likely to have the greatest impact. Figure 1 provides a summary of the proposed recommendations for selected land uses, as well as a sample of the minimums from peer and best practice cities which helped to inform the recommendations.

It should be noted that the proposed standards represent minimum parking requirements, not the precise number of parking spaces that will be built. A developer may choose to provide additional parking, based on an analysis of market demand. Minimum standards simply provide the "floor" for parking spaces, and cannot be reduced unless by employing the specific measures that are described below.

Figure 1. Proposed Reductions in Parking Minimums for Selected Land Uses

Land Use	Existing Standard	Proposed Standard	Peer/Best Practice City Standards
Multifamily in DSP			
1 bedroom	1.25 spaces	1 space	Culver City: 1 space; Petaluma: 1 space
2+ bedrooms	2 spaces	2 spaces	Long Beach: 2 spaces; Pasadena: 2 spaces
Guest parking	.25 spaces per unit (w/ more than 4 units)	None or 1 per 10 units	Pasadena: 1 per 10 units; Denver: none
Retail	4 per 1,000 sq. ft.	3 per 1,000 sq. ft.	Pasadena: 3 per 1,000 sq. ft.; Culver City: 2.86 per 1,000 sq. ft.; W. Hollywood: 3.5 per 1,000 sq. ft.
Office	2.7 per 1,000 sq. ft.	2 per 1,000 sq. ft.	Denver: 2 per 1,000 sq. ft.; Sacramento: 1.7 per 1,000 sq. ft.; Hercules: 2 per 1,000 sq.ft.; Downtown Ventura: 2 per 1,000 sq. ft.
Medical/Dental Offices	5 per 1,000 sq. ft.	4 per 1,000 sq. ft.	Pasadena: 4 per 1,000 sq. ft.; Culver City: 2.86 per 1,000 sq.ft.
Bars/Taverns	10 per 1,000 sq. ft.	5 per 1,000 sq. ft.	Culver City, Pasadena, San Diego: 5 per 1,000 sq. ft.; Long Beach: 4 per 1,000 sq. ft.; Sacramento: 3.3 per 1,000 sq. ft.
Nightclubs	28.6 per 1,000 sq. ft. or 1 per each 5 fixed seats	20 per 1,000 sq. ft.	Sacramento: 10 per 1,000 sq.ft.; San Jose: 25 per 1,000 sq. ft.
Fast food restaurants	12.5 per 1,000 sq. ft.	5 per 1,000 sq. ft.	Denver: 5 per 1,000 sq. ft.; Long Beach: 5 per 1,000 sq. ft. plus 1 per 3 seats; Petaluma: 3.3 per 1,000 sq. ft.
Restaurants	10 per 1,000 sq. ft.	5 per 1,000 sq. ft.	Denver: 5 per 1,000 sq. ft.; San Diego: 2.5 per 1,000 sq. ft.

2. Amend change of use regulations to allow for parking exemptions for commercial spaces smaller than 5,000 square feet.

According to the Glendale zoning code, if a building expansion creates an increase in floor area or additional seats then additional parking must be provided to meet the minimum parking requirements. Change of use and reuse regulations are particularly pertinent to Brand Boulevard and other streets near downtown Glendale, where small commercial spaces turn over frequently and a number of vacancies present opportunity sites for new development. However, with limited options for on-site parking, it is difficult to encourage developers to locate to Glendale’s “Main Street” because it is challenging or impossible to provide the required parking. Developers at these sites almost always request exemptions from parking requirements, which are fully discretionary and can create uncertainty for developers. The current parking code, however, does provide some major exceptions to the change of use and reuse regulations, including:

- Additions of floor area up to 25 percent of a designated historic resource on the Glendale Register of Historic Resources shall be exempt.
- Any change of use permitted in a historic resource shall not be required to provide additional parking to that legally required prior to the change of use.
- Changes in use of commercial spaces under 2,000 square feet are not required to add more parking.

It is recommended that the City amend change of use exceptions to state that changes in use of commercial spaces under 5,000 square feet are not required to add additional parking. Such revisions will help to encourage redevelopment of smaller commercial establishments by lowering the parking burden on developers.

3. Provide a robust menu of options to *meet* parking requirements.

While minimum parking standards are only recommended to be adjusted in targeted ways, the recommendations include increasing the opportunity for developers to comply with minimum parking requirements through "state of the practice" parking management techniques. These techniques do not reduce parking minimums themselves, but provide a toolkit that allows a developer to meet their requirement in the most efficient way possible. By providing developers with the option and flexibility to meet parking standards, the City can promote an environment that is both friendly to development and supportive of multimodal and sustainable growth. Outlined below are the key alternative methods. It should be noted that none of these alternatives would be required – a developer would consider the cost of building to the minimums (or above), the market advantages for doing so, and would balance those considerations against the opportunity offered by any one or a combination of the techniques outlined below.

3.1 – Eliminate requirement that all parking be independently accessible and allow for tandem and/or stacked parking as of right.

Glendale's minimum parking requirements, coupled with the current code requirement that all parking be independently accessible, means that often more than one square foot of parking area is required for every square foot of building. These requirements add significant additional expense to development – especially when parking is provided underground – and can act as a barrier to new development and adaptive reuse projects necessary to add vitality to downtown Glendale. In addition, when site conditions or financial constraints prompt developers to provide the required independently available parking on-site, the result is often monolithic parking podiums that present a "blank wall" to the pedestrian realm.

Tandem and/or stacked parking is an effective tool for reducing the need to construct additional off-street spaces and enabling more efficient use of existing facilities. The City of Glendale currently allows for tandem parking, but its regulations are strictly limited to parking spaces only "in excess of minimum requirements." The Glendale parking code is silent on stacked parking.

Glendale should eliminate its requirement that all parking be independently accessible and revise its tandem parking requirements to allow for greater flexibility and more widespread use of this parking management tool. A number of specific parameters for tandem and stacked parking are recommended:

- Tandem and/or stacked spaces are permitted to count against parking minimums, as is the case in many other cities. For example, a single tandem or stacked parking space would count as two spaces, not one.
- For residential uses: 100 percent of off-street spaces required in residential uses should be allowed to incorporate tandem and/or stacked parking, under the condition that any given set of tandem/stacked spaces shall be assigned to the same unit.
- For non-residential uses: 50 percent of off-street spaces required in non-residential uses should be allowed to incorporate tandem and/or stacked parking, under the condition that valet parking is also provided.
- Tandem spaces shall have a recommended minimum size of 8.5 feet by 36 feet.

3.2 – Allow for shared parking as of right.

Shared parking works best when uses with different peak demand periods share spaces, thereby reducing the number of spaces needed to meet the combined peak parking demands. Shared parking also has the benefit of encouraging drivers to park once and visit multiple

sites on foot rather than driving to and parking at each site. This reduces vehicle traffic and increases foot traffic, creating a safer pedestrian environment. The City's existing zoning code allows parking to be shared among different uses but requires additional approvals, permits and public hearings to receive permission to share parking among compatible uses. In order to make the process of securing approval for shared parking less onerous for new downtown development and adaptive reuse projects, the City should:

- Allow parking to be shared among different uses within a single mixed use building as of right upon staff approval.
- Allow parking to be shared among different buildings and uses at an off-site facility by right upon staff approval, provided that the two uses are within a 1,000 foot walking distance of each other. Shared parking in excess of 1,000 feet walking distance between parking facility and destination may be allowed with approval by staff when accompanied by a detailed parking management plan showing how the shared facility will meet occupant's needs and that a reasonable provision has been made to allow off-site parkers to access the principal use (e.g. shuttle bus, valet parking, free Beeline transit passes, etc.).
- Shared on-site or off-site parking should be allowed to satisfy 100 percent of the minimum parking requirement for each use, so long as documentation can be provided that the existing or anticipated land use(s) will have different periods of peak parking demand, that the shared parking can accommodate the parking demand for both uses.
- When public parking is leased as shared and/or off-site parking for private development and adaptive reuse projects, the City should charge market rates. The City should monitor occupancy rates for individual facilities and increase parking rates when occupancy exceeds 85 percent.

3.3 – Implement an in-lieu parking fee within the DSP area.

An in-lieu parking fee gives developers the option to pay a fee "in-lieu" of providing some portion of the number of parking spaces ordinarily required by the city's zoning ordinance. In-lieu fees provide flexibility for developers and enables projects (especially adaptive/historic reuse projects) that would have once been financially infeasible to move forward. The fees collected can also be used to build public parking spaces, manage parking supply, and/or to support mobility strategies in the downtown area.

As part of the *Downtown Mobility Plan* and its August 2008 memo on in-lieu fees, Nelson\Nygaard provided a detailed analysis of in-lieu fees, the high cost of providing parking in Glendale, a peer review of other in-lieu fee programs, and a tailored methodology for determining a new in-lieu fee in the DSP. The key recommendations from those documents remain relevant. They include:

- A combination of fee types (one-time and annual) is recommended. It is recommended that new developments are charged a *one-time* fee in order to avoid revenue collection issues which can occur when a property changes owners. In addition, a one-time fee would allow developers to more easily incorporate the fee into financial analyses and can decide early in the development or redevelopment process whether to provide the parking or pay the fee. By contrast, change of land uses should pay an *annual* fee. This option provides more flexibility, particularly since changing land uses poses more of a financial risk, such as when a retail establishment becomes a restaurant with no guarantee of financial success.
- The in-lieu fee ordinance should clearly state that once the annual in-lieu fee has been established, the fee remains with the land use rather than the property owner.

- The recommended *one-time* fee is \$24,000 per space. The recommended *annual* fee is \$600 per space per year.
- Fees should be adjusted every year according to the Consumer Price Index (CPI).
- Change of use projects should be allowed to use the in-lieu fee to forgo any portion up to 100 percent of required parking, however new developments are limited to using the in-lieu fee to no more than 50 percent of their adjusted parking demand.

4. Provide additional methods, or a “toolbox,” to further *reduce* parking requirements by implementing proven techniques that decrease parking demand.

In addition to providing alternatives for new development to *meet* parking requirements, it is also recommended that the City provide a number of options to *reduce* the overall amount of required parking by implementing and monitoring programs that are proven to reduce overall parking demand. By reducing the amount of required parking, the “toolbox” outlined below will provide developers with additional design flexibility and further enhance the financial feasibility of new projects. Furthermore, such methods can be used to leverage existing City investments in transit and other strategies to reduce driving while promoting sustainable growth.

4.1 – Proximity to transit.

In an effort to encourage the use of alternatives to driving, reduce dependence on vehicles, and leverage existing investments in transit, many cities grant parking reductions for projects located close to major transit facilities. These reductions typically come in one of two forms: an “across the board” reduction regardless of land use; or reductions tailored specifically to the proposed land use. It is recommended that the City of Glendale offer the latter method as a way to further reduce parking requirements. The following parameters are recommended:

- Projects eligible for parking reductions would include all new development, regardless of land use, within 1/4th mile of a “major transit facility”. A “major transit facility” is defined as: a bus stop that serves both local and regional transit with a net 15-minute peak-hour headway. Based on the current network of local (Beeline) and regional (Metro Rapid and Metro Local/Limited) bus routes serving the DSP zone, the streets that currently have a major transit facility in the DSP zone are Brand Avenue, Central Avenue, Broadway, and Colorado Street.
- Given the relatively low transit mode share in Glendale, it is recommended that the City take a slightly less aggressive approach than what other best practice cities have done. For example, the City of Denver grants up to a 25 percent reduction for any land use within 1/4th of a mile of a transit station. Given the relatively low transit mode share in Glendale, it is recommended that the City take a slightly less aggressive approach than what other best practice cities have done. More specifically, the City should implement a two-tier reduction program.
 - Tier 1: 10 percent parking reduction for all new development within 1/8th of a mile of major transit facility regardless of land use.
 - Tier 2: 5 percent parking reduction for all new development within 1/4th of a mile of major transit facility regardless of land use.

4.2 – Transportation Demand Management (TDM) programs

As detailed in Nelson\Nygaard's April 2010 memorandum, transportation demand management (TDM) programs have proven to be very successful in reducing the need for drive-alone commute trips, and thereby the demand for parking. TDM programs work by providing incentives to use alternative modes. The most effective TDM programs include some form of financial incentive, either through pricing parking or subsidizing transit and other alternative modes. This can be done through a parking cash out program or other program where employees are given a choice about how to spend transportation dollars. The City currently has a TDM ordinance (see Chapter 30.32.170 of the Glendale Municipal Code), which applies to only non-residential development and only requires limited TDM measures, such as informational and promotional materials, vanpool/carpool parking, and limited bicycle parking. The recommendations included below are designed to tie the commitment to transportation demand management to the reduction in parking requirements.

Figure 2 below provides a menu of TDM measures organized into six general categories. Some of these measures are more applicable to retail/commercial developments, others would work best with residential projects, and some are applicable to all types of land uses. While it is not an exhaustive list, it does include the most common TDM measures. Additional programs could be included if found to be applicable to the DSP zone. A relative "score" has been given to each TDM measure based on its proven ability to reduce drive-alone rates and demand for parking. For example, research has shown that financial incentives, such as pricing of parking, parking cash out, and subsidized transit, are the most effective ways to reduce drive alone commutes.² As such, these financial incentives would be assigned a higher point total than, for example, marketing services, an effective, yet less robust TDM measure. Research has also shown that a "well-balanced" TDM program that offers a variety of measures which support each other (e.g. a subsidized transit pass program in addition to a Guaranteed-Ride-Home program) will be more effective than a TDM program built around a single trip reduction measure. Therefore, to obtain more significant parking reductions a new development would have to demonstrate a TDM program that utilizes a variety of trip reduction measures.

Under this recommendation, developers could establish a TDM program for their development using the menu provided in Figure 2, and after submitting their TDM plan to the City, could be granted a reduction in parking requirement based on how comprehensive and robust a program they offer. Depending on the total point value of the TDM program, each development would qualify for a reduction from the minimum parking requirements. It is recommended that Glendale provide a "tiered" range of percent reductions as away to incentivize robust and diverse TDM programs, as well as specific TDM measures that are known to be particularly effective. As outlined in Figure 3, the proposed range of parking reductions includes three tiers. For example, in order to obtain a 20 percent parking reduction, a TDM program must generate a minimum of 10 points from at least three different TDM categories. The highest reduction, 30 percent, would require at least 15 points from four different categories, one of which must be a parking or financial incentive measure.

² See April 2, 2010 TDM memo for detailed findings.

Figure 2. Potential TDM measures and proposed point values

Potential TDM Measures Eligible for Parking Reductions	Summary of TDM Measure	Proposed Point Values
Parking		
Pricing parking	Pricing parking for commuters.	6
Financial Incentives		
Subsidized Transit	Provide free or highly reduced transit passes.	5
Parking Cash-out	Employees who do not drive to work are offered a cash value equal to parking subsidies.	5
Commuter benefit programs	Use tax-free dollars to pay for commuting expenses.	4
Free HOV/Carpool Parking	Free parking for HOV or carpools.	1
Automobile Trip Consolidation		
Carpool/Vanpool Programs	Shared use of private vehicle or rented/purchased vans.	2
Rideshare Matching Services	Help commuters find travel partners and share costs.	3
Guaranteed Ride Home	Provide occasional subsidized rides to commuters to help deal with unexpected conditions.	3
Shuttle services	Shuttle service to/from location and public transit facilities.	4
Scheduling		
Telecommute	Use of telecommunications to substitute for physical travel.	2
Flextime	Employees are allowed some flexibility in their daily work schedules.	2
Compressed work week	Employees work fewer but longer days.	1
Staggered shifts	Shifts are staggered to reduce the number of employees arriving and leaving at one time.	1
Promotion		
Marketing/Outreach	Determining consumer needs/preferences, creating appropriate products, and promoting use.	1
Travel Training	Provide individualized training/materials on transit, ridesharing, car sharing, and bicycle systems.	2
Transportation Coordinator	Professionals who implement and monitor TDM programs.	3
Multi-modal Infrastructure		
Car sharing	Provide access and/or reduced fees for car sharing facilities.	4
Bike sharing	Provide access and/or reduced fees for bike sharing facilities.	3
On-site amenities	Includes showers/lockers, secure bicycle parking, child care services, etc.	2

Figure 3. Proposed range of parking reductions and point thresholds

	% Reduction	Point Thresholds	Annual Monitoring	TMA Membership
Tier 1	10% reduction	6-9	Required	Required
Tier 2	20% reduction	10-14 (from 3 categories)	Required	Required
Tier 3	30% reduction	15+ (from 4 categories, including at least 1 parking or financial incentive)	Required	Required

Finally, it is recommended that each development wishing to obtain a parking reduction by implementing a TDM program should also be subject to a number of additional requirements to ensure the effectiveness of the TDM program. These conditions include:

- Annual Reporting:** TDM programs are only as effective as their ongoing management. As a result, it is recommended that the City of Glendale require that each development monitor its TDM program annually to not only ensure compliance among businesses and tenants, but also document effectiveness. The City should require that each development conduct an annual survey of its TDM programs and participants. This survey information would then be used to produce an annual citywide report which would document the mode share shifts and TDM participation.

The Lloyd District TMA in Portland, Oregon provides an excellent example of an annual effort made to evaluate and quantify the effects of TDM programs.³

- **TMA Membership:** Each development granted a parking reduction via a TDM program should also be required to join a Transportation Management Association (TMA). Mandatory membership would increase the effectiveness of TMAs and generate additional revenue for citywide mobility programs. This requirement would be designed to complement Recommendation #5.
- **Leasing Requirement:** Any development that obtains a parking reduction via a TDM program would need to include in the tenant lease a requirement for mandatory implementation of the approved TDM measures. This requirement would help to ensure that approved TDM measures are being implemented by all tenants of any new development, and that their parking reductions are justified. This requirement would run with the lease and not with the tenant. For residential projects, the TDM measures would be a part of the HOA agreement and could not be changed without penalty to the City.

5. Require all new development, of a certain size located within the DSP, to become members of a Glendale TMA.

In addition to requiring TMA membership for any new development with a TDM program, the City should also require all new development, of a certain size, to become dues paying members of a TMA. This would yield a significant revenue stream from new development to be spent on programs to improve transportation, both for that new development and for all employees, residents, and visitors to within Glendale's downtown specific plan area. The City should require that new commercial properties of at least 30,000 square feet join the TMA serving their location. Additionally, all new residential development, with 8 or more units in a single development, should also be required to join a TMA. Finally, this requirement would apply not the tenant but to the development itself. This particular recommendation is discussed in greater detail in the August 8, 2008 memo.

6. Eliminate or reduce the need for discretionary administrative exceptions by allowing all recommended parking alternatives and reductions as of right.

The City of Glendale currently offers two methods by which a reduction in parking requirements can be obtained. First, owners or developers can apply for an administrative exception to the parking code, which are limited in scope (three spaces or 5 percent, whichever is greater). Second, there is a discretionary process by which the City Council can reduce parking requirements under certain conditions – mixed use projects, new construction near existing parking, adjacent to transit, projects in redevelopment areas, and disabilities upgrade. Currently, many developers request exceptions for their projects through one of these two methods, and are usually granted such an exception by City Council.

Unfortunately, this process has a number of significant drawbacks. First, it creates a large administrative burden on the City, as both staff and Council must process and evaluate each request individually. Second, the City essentially gives the reduction away for “free” and gets little in return, other than the desired development. Many of these exceptions rely on publicly available parking to meet their parking demand, and as public parking spaces are a limited (though currently very plentiful) commodity, the City must be able to weigh requests carefully. Finally, the discretionary process for granting reductions ultimately undermines the

³ Lloyd District TMA – [Annual Report 2010](#).

effectiveness of any larger parking management strategy. Parking policies exist to guide overall management of the City's supply and demand of parking, yet consistent exceptions to these policies create "loopholes" that make efficient parking management even more challenging.

Therefore, it is recommended that the City dramatically reduce the use of administrative exceptions and discretionary review of parking requirements. By implementing the revisions to the parking minimums and providing a well-defined menu of reduction strategies, there should no longer be a need for a developer to go to City Council for an exception. The recommendations provided in this memorandum offer a clear and defined path by which new developments can meet or reduce their parking requirements. Furthermore, the City can reduce its administrative burden and ensure that parking reductions are consistent with, and supportive of, larger parking management goals. For example, providing the option of paying an in-lieu parking fee to satisfy some portion of a property's parking requirements would reduce the number of parking requirement reduction requests made, thus reducing administrative work involved in this process, and would also raise money for the City to spend on additional transportation projects or mobility programs. Parking exceptions would still be possible, but should be considered favorably by Council only after all other available remedies have been exhausted.

7. Adopt a bicycle parking ordinance

In recent years many cities have adopted bicycle parking requirements for new development. These ordinances are designed to encourage the use of non-motorized travel modes, ensure that bicyclists have adequate infrastructure, and reduce the need for vehicle parking. The City of Glendale currently has limited requirements for bicycle parking in nonresidential developments (see Chapter 30.32.170 of Glendale Municipal Code). It is recommended that the City create a more comprehensive ordinance that applies to all land uses within the DSP. It should be noted that while bicycle parking is available as a potential TDM reduction measure, a statutory bicycle parking ordinance is preferred, as it would formalize the provision of bicycle parking, a crucial piece of non-motorized infrastructure, in all new City developments.

Bicycle parking ordinances are similar to existing parking requirements in that they set general provisions for applicability, detail facility design standards, and detail the minimum number of bicycle parking spaces by land use. For example, 1 space for every 20 dwelling units in a multi-family residential project or 1 space for every 10,000 square feet of office space.⁴ These minimum requirements would be tailored to respond to the demand and need for bicycle parking in downtown Glendale.

Numerous cities have also leveraged their bicycle parking ordinances to offer vehicle parking reductions for bicycle parking that is supplied beyond the minimum. It is recommended that the City of Glendale adopt a similar provision in any new bicycle parking ordinance. The City should allow bicycle parking to substitute for up to 10 percent of required parking. Such a provision would reflect policies in best practice cities, such as Portland, which allows bicycle parking to substitute for up to 25 percent of required parking, but be more consistent with local conditions in Glendale. Like in Portland, existing parking spaces in Glendale should also be allowed to be converted to take advantage of this provision. For example, for every five *non-required* bicycle parking spaces that provide short (standard bicycle racks) or long-term (secure bicycle parking, such as a bicycle locker) bicycle parking, the motor vehicle parking requirement is reduced by one space.

⁴ See example: City of Oakland – [Bicycle Parking Ordinance](#)

Summary of Parking Recommendations

The recommendations outlined in this memorandum will not solve all of Glendale's parking inefficiencies, but they are carefully designed to enable the City to address its most pressing parking challenges in a pragmatic and readily achievable manner. It is also important to note that all of the recommendations outlined in this memorandum are "additive." In other words, these recommendations have been created to purposefully allow new developments to achieve significant reductions in parking. Figure 4 provides a simplified illustration of how these recommendations could coalesce to offer a maximum parking reduction for a 100-unit multifamily residential project in the DSP zone, as well as the innovative methods a developer could utilize to meet its parking requirement.

Figure 4. Illustration of Parking Reductions with Proposed Recommendations

Proposed Project: 100-unit (50 1 bdrm, 50 2+ bdrm) multifamily residential project; Located in DSP zone; 1/8th of a mile from transit		
	Existing Requirement	With Proposed Recommendations
50 1 bedroom units	62.5	50
50 2+ bedroom units	100	100
Guest Parking	25	0
Baseline Requirement	187.5	150
Potential Reductions Using Proposed "Reduction Toolbox"		
1/8 of a mile to major transit facility (-10%)	n/a	15 space reduction
15-point TDM program (-30%)	n/a	45 space reduction
Bicycle parking beyond minimum (-10%)	n/a	15 space reduction
Baseline Requirement w/ Maximum Reductions	n/a	75
Additional Methods to Meet Baseline Requirement		
Use of tandem/stacked	n/a	Up to 100%
Use of shared parking, if applicable	n/a	Up to 100%
Use of an in-lieu fee	n/a	Up to 50%

Under the current code, this example development would need to provide a baseline of 187.5 parking spaces. However, under the proposed revisions to the parking code, that baseline would be reduced to 150 spaces. Utilizing the new "toolbox," a developer could achieve further reductions. In this example, the developer has agreed to create an aggressive TDM and bicycle parking program, plus take advantage of proximity to a major transit corridor. This combination of toolbox reductions would reduce the minimum parking requirement to 75 spaces. This is not to suggest that any developer would build a 100 unit building with only 75 spaces, but that the required minimum would drop to this level, and then allow the developer to determine the number of spaces needed for a saleable development.

Once the developer determines the number of spaces to be provided, he could meet the requirement entirely on site, through shared or off-site parking and or by paying an in-lieu fee. The maximum potential for those methods are also shown on Figure 4. While these recommendations represent a significant change to the way parking is managed in Glendale, they are not designed to let developers avoid their parking responsibilities, but rather to push them to concretely demonstrate a strong commitment to smart growth planning and progressive parking and trip reduction policies. Ultimately, the reforms will give developers the additional flexibility they need to meet parking requirements in a manner that supports the City of Glendale's vision for a walkable, sustainable, and multimodal downtown.

Figure 5. Summary of Parking Recommendations

Recommendation	Key Elements	Potential Impacts			
1. Targeted reductions to minimum requirements.	Lower parking minimums for key land uses in DSP: multifamily residential, office, retail, etc.	Reduced parking burden; Improved project feasibility			
2. Amend change of use exceptions.	Allow for parking exceptions for commercial spaces smaller than 5,000 square feet	Improved project feasibility			
3. Provide a menu of alternatives to meet parking requirements.	1. Allow tandem/stacked to count towards minimum.	Residential: 100% of minimum (same unit) Non-residential: 50% of minimum (w/ valet services)			
	2. Allow shared parking among uses in a mixed-use building.				
	Allow shared parking among different uses or an off-site parking facility by right upon staff approval, provided that the two uses are within the DSP boundaries and within a 1,000 foot walking shed of each other.	100% of minimum			
	3. In-lieu fees: Combination of fee types				
	<table border="0" style="width: 100%;"> <tr> <td style="padding-left: 40px;">Fee remains with land use, not property owner</td> <td rowspan="4" style="vertical-align: middle;">Change of use: 100% of minimum New development 50% of minimum</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding-left: 40px;">\$24,000 per space (one-time)</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding-left: 40px;">\$600 per space (annual)</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding-left: 40px;">Adjusted annually</td> </tr> </table>	Fee remains with land use, not property owner	Change of use: 100% of minimum New development 50% of minimum	\$24,000 per space (one-time)	\$600 per space (annual)
Fee remains with land use, not property owner	Change of use: 100% of minimum New development 50% of minimum				
\$24,000 per space (one-time)					
\$600 per space (annual)					
Adjusted annually					
4. Provide additional methods to further reduce parking requirements.	1. Proximity to transit	1/4 mile: 5% reduction 1/8 mile: 10% reduction			
	2. Implement a "point-based" TDM program.				
	3 "tiers" of parking reduction.	Tier I: 10% reduction Tier II: 20% reduction Tier III: 30% reduction			
	<table border="0" style="width: 100%;"> <tr> <td style="padding-left: 40px;">Required annual reporting and TMA membership.</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding-left: 40px;">TDM leasing requirement.</td> </tr> </table>	Required annual reporting and TMA membership.	TDM leasing requirement.		
Required annual reporting and TMA membership.					
TDM leasing requirement.					
5. Require mandatory TMA membership	Require all new development in DSP (commercial development great than 30,000 sq. ft; residential developments with 8 or more units) to join the Glendale TMA.	Additional revenue for mobility programs.			
6. Allow for parking alternatives and reductions as of right	Reduce the need for administrative exceptions by providing a well-defined path for meeting and/or reducing minimum requirements.	Reduced administrative burden; Additional revenue; Consistent regulatory framework			
7. Adopt a bicycle parking ordinance.	Require all new development in DSP to provide bicycle parking. Allow additional vehicle parking reductions for bicycle parking built in excess of minimum standards.	Formalize bicycle parking as a key mobility strategy. Up to 10% reduction.			