

RESIDENTIAL PARKING WORKING GROUP MEETING EIGHT READ-AHEAD MATERIALS

In preparation for Residential Parking Working Group Meeting Eight, staff have assembled the feedback that we received from the following events:

- The Residential Parking Working Group Open Houses on December 7th and December 17th, 2016.
- A presentation to NAIOP's December meeting on the morning of December 14th.
- A small group discussion on the evening of December 14th.
- Comments received through the Residential Parking Working Group web site between December 8th, 2016 and January 6th, 2017.

Please read the following sections:

[Themes from Feedback Received](#)

[Summary of Online Comments and Open House Comment Forms](#)

[Summary of Open Houses One and Two](#)

[Summary of Presentation on the Residential Parking Working Group Process to NAIOP](#)

[Summary of a Small Group Discussion on the Residential Parking Working Group with Community Members](#)

Themes from Feedback Received

[Editor's Note: The original version of this feedback summary did not include some responses received in the days immediately before the online survey closed on January 6th. This version has been updated to reflect all responses. Changes from the original document posted to the Residential Parking Working Group web site prior to Meeting Eight are marked here with underlines (in the case of additions) and strikethroughs (for removals). The Working Group received a summary of findings that reflected all responses at Meeting Eight on January 18th.]

One theme heard was that because transit is not equally available throughout the County and Metro and Metro bus service is not reliable, cars are still needed to get around Arlington.

Spillover Parking - Spillover parking, competition for on-street parking spaces (between single-family residents and apartment dwellers, employees and residents, etc.) and interest in the Residential Permit Parking program (i.e. enforcement, program changes, follow-up surveys) came through in the online surveys, the Focus Group and the Open Houses. Several participants commented that multi-family buildings should not be able to participate in the RPP program (no change is being considered).

Strategies

At the open houses and through the online comment form, we asked participants to say if they support each of the policy strategies that the Working Group has been considering.

- Respondents were *strongly supportive* of pedestrian and bicycle facilities (74%), on-site (74%) and off-site shared parking (68%).
- Respondents were *supportive* of on-site car-sharing services/spaces (61%), incentives for transit (61%) and transit overlay zones (58%).
- The percentage of respondents that supported parking ratio reductions for affordable housing was 48% while those opposed represented 42% of respondents.
- Respondents were least supportive of reductions for “bikeability” and “walkability” (39%).
- The strategy Parking Ratio Reductions for Small Sites was inadvertently dropped from the on-line survey, resulting on only three responses.

There seems to be general agreement that shared parking needs more incentives to make it happen. NAIOP members, though supportive of shared parking, spoke to certain limiting factors:

- Insufficient institutional supports for shared parking in the County
- Operational choices in garages (i.e. to offer reserved parking or not) and
- Feasibility is greatest if the developer owns *both* the sharing and benefitting buildings.

Additional Strategies

Several new strategies were suggested by participants and respondents:

- County should add park and ride lots and work to create shared parking with lots that go unused during the day. The respondent cited the theater parking at Potomac Yards as an example of this.
- Different parking ratios for condos and multi-family rental buildings
- Demand pricing for on-street parking spaces
- Tandem parking in garages
- Pedestrian-oriented streets with on-street parking but the primary purpose is play and walking

Several new strategies were suggested by participants and respondents:

- Different parking ratios for condos and multi-family rental buildings
- Demand pricing for on-street parking spaces
- Tandem parking in garages
- Pedestrian-oriented streets with on-street parking but the primary purpose is play and walking

Summary of Online Comments and Open House Comment Forms

Overview and Respondent Demographics

- 2131 respondents, including two who were not Arlington residents
- The survey was available for comment from December 8th, 2016 to January 6th, 2017. Respondents could fill out a parallel paper form at the open houses on December 7th, and December 17th.
- 57% of respondents reported that they lived in single-family dwellings, 33% in condos or co-ops, and 10% in townhouses
- 48% of respondents reported that their address was in or abutted a civic association in the Rosslyn-Ballston Corridor, 10% in the J-D Corridor, 10% in East Falls Church and the remainder outside a Metro corridor or the County (2).

Principles

Respondents were asked to respond to the Working Group's principles with the prompt "Are there other principles that you would include? Comment on the Working Group's principles and any that you would add"

- No new principles were suggested.
- Respondents expressed the view that parking is necessary for quality of life in Arlington, and that, despite traffic and congestion, cars are necessary for residents to be able to get around the County since much of the County is not well-served by any form of transit

- One respondent recommended that less parking was desirable to support walkability in the community and recommended reductions for affordable housing units targets to those below 50% AMI

Share your Thoughts: Arlington Parking Strategies

Respondents were asked “to tell us which strategies you think are right for Arlington.” For each, respondents could respond with “Yes,” “No,” or “Don’t Know.”

- Respondents were *strongly supportive* of pedestrian and bicycle facilities ~~and~~ (74%), on-site (74%) and off-site shared parking (68%).
- Respondents were *supportive* of on-site car-sharing services/spaces, (61%), incentives for transit, (61%) and transit overlay zones (58%).
- The percentage of respondents that supported parking ratio reductions for affordable housing was 52.48% while those opposed represented 48.42% of respondents.
- Respondents were ~~evenly split on~~ least supportive of reductions for “bikeability” and “walkability” (39%).
- The strategy Parking Ratio Reductions for Small Sites was inadvertently dropped from the on-line survey, resulting in only ~~three~~ four responses through the paper forms at the Open Houses.

Share your Thoughts: Arlington Parking Strategies—Summary of Responses

| Policy Strategy | Number of Responses | | |
|--|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| | Yes | No | Don't Know/No Answer |
| Affordable Housing Parking Ratio Reductions | 13 (52) <u>15 (48%)</u> | 12 (48) <u>13 (42%)</u> | 0 <u>3 (10%)</u> |
| Parking Ratio Reductions for Small Development Sites | 3 (100 <u>97%</u>) | 0 <u>1 (3%)</u> | 0 |
| On-Site Shared Parking | 18 (75) <u>23 (74%)</u> | 6 (25 <u>19%</u>) | 0 <u>2 (6%)</u> |
| Off-Site Shared Parking | 18 (75) <u>21 (68%)</u> | 5 (21) <u>7 (23%)</u> | 1 (4) <u>3 (10%)</u> |
| On-Site Car Sharing Services/Spaces | 15 (63) <u>19 (61%)</u> | 8 (33) <u>10 (32%)</u> | 1 (4) <u>2 (6%)</u> |
| Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities | 19 (79) <u>23 (74%)</u> | 5 (21) <u>6 (19%)</u> | 0 <u>2 (6%)</u> |
| Incentives for Transit | 14 (58) <u>19 (61%)</u> | 9 (38 <u>29%</u>) | 1 (4) <u>3 (10%)</u> |
| Transit Overlay Zones | 13 (54) <u>18 (58%)</u> | 7 (33) <u>6 (19%)</u> | 4 (13) <u>7 (23%)</u> |
| Parking Ratio Reductions for “Bikeability” and “Walkability” | 11 (46) <u>12 (39%)</u> | 11 (46) <u>14 (45%)</u> | 2 (8) <u>5 (16%)</u> |

Note – Percentages may not total to 100% due to rounding.

Strategies we have missed

Respondents were asked “Are there any parking strategies that we have missed?”

- The dominant comment in this section related to current unreliability of Metro and Metro bus service. A number of respondents expressed the view that until transit service improves, there should not be a reduction in parking.
- There was sentiment from some respondents that lower income residents need cars and that their parking should not be reduced as it will only cause them difficulties.
- Several new strategies was suggested:

- County should add park and ride lots and work to create shared parking with lots that go unused during the day. The respondent cited the theater parking at Potomac Yards as an example of this.
- Demand pricing for on-street parking
- Greater use of tandem parking where most feasible
- Pedestrian-oriented streetways that are available for parking but are primarily for play, walking, bikes

What else would you like to share about parking at new residential buildings?

What would you like to share about parking in Arlington in general?

Our comment form and online survey ended with the questions “What else would you like to share about parking at new residential buildings? What else would you like to share about parking in Arlington in general?”

- The dominant comments in this section stressed the continued need for cars in single-family neighborhoods to get around the County, to conduct business, for visitors and for other purposes. The unreliability of Metro service also was cited.
- One respondent suggested that the strategies might eliminate the need for a second car but would not lead to zero cars in most households.
- One respondent suggested that RPP should focus less on day-long passes and provide more for several hours (i.e. 3 day vs. 3-4 hour passes) which are needed more; that the County should validate use and should look at the size of zones, particularly older zones.
- A number of respondents spoke to concerns about spillover parking, and competition between single-family house residents and multi-family tenants for available street parking
- One respondent suggested that more needed to be done to incentivize shared parking

Summary of Open Houses One and Two

Dates/Times: Open House One: Wednesday, December 7th, 2016 5:30 PM to 7:30 PM; Open House Two: Saturday, December 17th, 2016 10 AM to 12 PM.

Locations: Open House One: The Navy League Building Conference Room, 2300 Wilson Boulevard. Open House Two: The Connection: Crystal City, 2100 Crystal Drive.

Open House Description

At both events, staff displayed [11 presentation boards](#) that described the following:

- The charge of the Residential Parking Working Group.
- Area of the county where the Working Group and staff's recommended policy would affect development proposals.
- The Working Group's adopted guiding principles.
- Background on Arlington's parking minimum for multi-family residential buildings as found in the zoning ordinance, as well as changes in transportation infrastructure since those minimums were set, as well as facts about parking construction and use in Arlington.
- Highlights from staff's research into parking policies around North America.
- The parking strategies that the Working Group is considering for inclusion in its recommendation.
- Next steps for the Working Group.

Staff encouraged attendees to make comment verbally to staff on hand, to speak with members of the Working Group that were present, by leaving sticky notes on posters, and finally, by filling out a comment form.

A copy of the comment form is included at the end of this document for reference.

Summary of Comment Form Feedback

The first question on our feedback form asked participants which of the Working Group's adopted principles were most important to them and which principles they would add. Though some comments were not directly related to the principles presented, here are the verbatim copies of comments received.

Responses to the Question “Are their other principles that you would include? Which principles are important to you? Are there other principles that you would like to share?”

Housing affordability is a major issue for Arlington. While the neighborhood parking program addresses much of this, and more developments must continue to not be eligible for the program even if they are within the parking zones.

Principle #4 [“recognize that increasing the supply of parking is a factor that contributes to higher demand for driving. Therefore higher parking requirements will result in higher car use, traffic and environmental impacts”] is key. Also must recognize that off-street parking competes with on-street parking. Cannot change off-street supply and policy in isolation. Our on-street mismanagement is sabotaging our attempts to manage off street.

Dedicated parking for residential and commercial development to ensure space to park. Shared parking in communities to enable additional residential and commercial high density development. Crystal City/Pentagon City have extensive dedicated and shared parking which enables higher density development and enables shopping. Rosslyn and Ballston have much less shared public parking. Free or reduced price parking and charging for hybrid/Evs. (Need way more charging stations in private and public parking).

The comment form presented each of the policy strategies that the Working Group is considering and then to mark “Yes,” “No,” or “Don’t Know” in response to the prompt “we want you to tell us which strategies you think are right for Arlington.” Here is a summary of responses for each strategy listed.

Responses to “We want you to tell us which strategies you think are right for Arlington. For each, select ‘Yes,’ ‘No,’ or ‘Don’t Know’”

| Policy Strategy | Number of Responses | | |
|---|---------------------|----|------------|
| | Yes | No | Don't Know |
| Affordable Housing Parking Ratio Reductions | 3 | 1 | 0 |
| Parking Ratio Reductions for Small Development Sites | 3 | 0 | 0 |
| On-Site Shared Parking | 3 | 0 | 0 |
| Off-Site Shared Parking | 3 | 0 | 0 |
| On-Site Car-sharing Spaces/Service | 3 | 0 | 0 |
| Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities | 3 | 0 | 0 |
| Incentives for Transit | 2 | 0 | 1 |
| Transit Overlay Zones | 2 | 0 | 1 |
| Parking Ratio Reductions for “Bikeability” and “Walkability” | 1 | 0 | 2 |

In addition, one participant wrote “I'd like to know if there is experience with these that show that they work” next to the “Incentives for Transit” item and “would this be redundant to some of the other strategies” for the Parking Ratio Reductions for "Bikeability" and "Walkability" item.

When asked if there are other strategies that they would include, participants gave the following responses:

Responses to the question “are there any parking strategies that we have missed?”

The role of on-street parking. Demand pricing for on-street parking. What sort of certainty can we give developers on parking so that they can get faster approvals if they are within certain parameters?

Nope!

Must work with homeowners, HOA/Condo associations and S/M/L work places to develop consensus on current short [illegible] and needs and long-term needs and opportunities and vision.

And creative ways to meet parking demand. Tandem parking in areas where sharing spaces this way is most feasible (ie, elementary school lots). Pedestrian-oriented streetways that are available for parking but which primary purpose is play, walking (woonerf - dutch). Thanks great open house - lots of info and helpful staff.

Finally, when asked “What else would you like to share about parking at new residential buildings? What else would you like to share about parking in Arlington in general?” only one participant gave an answer:

Must plan for large residential/commercial areas such as Crystal City/Pentagon City and Rosslyn-Ballston to enable livable residential and commercial development. The goal is to keep cars off surface streets when they are parked (at home or for work), so the streets can be used for driving, biking, walking, and shopping. Second need to incentivize car sharing and hybrid/EV use as they lower usage footprint (only used when needed) of carbon footprint (hybrid/EV). Both do this by reducing carbon usage.

Other Comments Received

Attendees also shared:

- Concerns about the availability of on-street parking in low-density neighborhoods and the belief that allowing builders to provide less parking in multi-family buildings would lead to a situation in which those buildings’ residents would still own multiple cars and try to park on street.
- The desire that the residents of Site Plan buildings continue to be kept from participating in the Residential Permit Parking program.
- A request that the Working Group also consider parking requirements for hotel uses.
- Requests for communication with Civic Associations about this project and the Working Group’s recommendations.

Attendees left the following comments on the presentation boards with sticky notes:

Comments Left on Presentation Boards with Sticky Notes

| |
|---|
| Please reach out to civic associations most affected to explain plan and get input |
| Question: after new apt. building is built - is RPP zone expanded in front of building? Example: Dittmar building on Jackson Street. |
| Consider tandem parking - predictable situations |
| Shared parking between bldgs. Share/split parking requirement between proposed building and existing unused inventory. |
| <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Apartment buildings/condos: Demographics are different. Ensure enough parking.2. Apartment parking operates like commercial; monthly/daily/hourly, more flexible.3. Size of spaces: don't reduce the size. |

Summary of Presentation on the Residential Parking Working Group Process to NAIOP

Meeting Date/Time: Wednesday, December 14, 2016, 8:30 – 10:00 a.m.

Meeting Location: Walsh Colucci Conference Room, Courthouse Plaza
(2200 Clarendon Blvd.)

Attendees: Dan VanPelt, Evan Pritchard, Jon Kinney, Peter Greenwald, Kedrick Whitmore, Gary Kirkbride, Robert Atkinson, Bob Bushkoff, John Lutostanski, Mike Novotny, and Stephen Crim, Susan Bell, Dennis Sellin, Samia Byrd. Editor's Note: The note takers believe that

Meeting Notes

Evan Pritchard, NAIOP Co-Chair, opened the meeting. Eric Dobson, NAIOP Director of Government Relations and Communications, announced upcoming NAIOP activities including several classes that will be offered in 2017. Following introductions, Mr. Pritchard turned the meeting over to Stephen Crim, Project Manager, for a presentation on the Residential Parking Working Group process and strategies under consideration. Handouts with definitions for each of the strategies were provided to the group. See slides of this presentation below.

Stephen indicated that staff needs feedback from NAIOP on the different strategies, and following the presentation, asked the group their views on shared parking as a strategy as well as a policy that would allow car-share parking, bike parking, or other facilities to count towards their parking requirements.

Barriers to Shared Parking

NAIOP members indicated that there are a number of barriers to shared parking, despite support for shared parking in Arlington County policy. Among the barriers are the following:

- When parking is reviewed in the site plan process, it is reviewed in “buckets” based on use (i.e. retail parking, residential parking). There is no focus on shared use of parking to be provided. Staff is not comfortable discussing flexible use of spaces or shared use on or off-site.
- The need for a site plan amendment for both the site plan that needs the parking and the site plan that would provide the parking is a disincentive to off-site shared parking. The site plan amendment process is very costly and time consuming—nearly \$100,000 according to one NAIOP member—which makes the project more costly. Neighbors may oppose shared parking.
- It's very difficult to work through the issues of shared parking beyond the needs of the first use of a retail space. If an occupant such as a grocery store wants to own their parking it is further complicated because the condominium regime needed to create this is not able to be processed until after the project is finished.
- It's also very difficult to develop an off-site shared parking arrangement when ownership of the properties involved is different; at some future point the property providing the parking might want to redevelop and would then be encumbered by a shared-parking agreement. Attendees also mentioned that banks might be less likely to finance projects that have a shared-parking arrangement on the property.
- More policy support for shared parking is needed and staff needs to be given the direction to promote it.

- Issues with on-site shared parking (Clarendon Center example) – scheduling of maintenance must be coordinated with tenant parking in mind; overnight car storage cannot occur in shared spaces; residential tenants cannot park overnight in office or retail spaces; retail tenants want access to office parking in off hours; assigned spaces for residential and office tenants limit ability to share.
- Issues with off-site shared parking – Timing; impact on redevelopment potential; creates an encumbrance on a property; no real incentive to do it (though it does happen when two buildings are owned by the same company). County still wants “more” when you agree to share and provide one space per unit.

Bike Share and Car Share

NAIOP members expressed an interest in getting credits for car share and bike share as well as other measures. There is sometimes a problem getting the car share companies to locate spaces in garages due to lack of visibility to potential users other than building occupants. This is a problem when a car share space in a garage costs the same as any other parking space, an estimated \$40,000. Car share spaces can create a problem if they take up retail parking in front of ground floor retail; store owners want the on-street parking available for customers. Alexandria puts car share spaces a block off the main streets; DC auctions off car share locations. There was a general preference among NAIOP members to provide car share spaces where they are needed on the street (not necessarily in a project’s garage) but give developers credit for them if they subsidize costs of providing them. Members suggested it would be useful to link reductions to all these options.

Other Discussion Points

Strategies should be looked at every few years so that the standards remain current with market. It would also be good to have some small percentage of flexibility in the requirements; it was noted that this provision exists though not for all projects.

NAIOP members then asked whether the RPWG recommendations will include a maximum parking ratio and if they will become zoning ordinance amendments. Staff explained that the group has already decided not to include maximums as part of their recommendations. Staff also clarified that the charge to the RPWG is only to develop policy recommendations, though they could become zoning ordinance amendments at a future date. There was general consensus among the NAIOP members that a zoning ordinance amendment was preferable to a policy. The concern is that an amendment would provide clearer guidance for staff, developers and the community and would be more consistent in application.

Summary of a Small Group Discussion on the Residential Parking Working Group with Community Members

Meeting Date/Time: Wednesday, December 14th, 2016, 6:00 PM – 7:00 PM

Meeting Location: Room 715, Courthouse Plaza (2100 Clarendon Blvd.)

Attendees: Terron Sims, Eric Cassel, Liz Birnbaum, Neil Schimmenti, Dave Tyahla, Jim Richardson, Jim Lantelme, Carrie Johnson, Ken Anderson, Bonnie Parker, Susan Bell, Stephen Crim, Richard Hartman, Michelle Cohen, Dennis Sellin, Bridget Obikoya, Dan Van Pelt. James Schroll, Ben Spiritos, and Michelle Winters were present for a portion of the conversation.

Meeting Notes

As part of the County's effort to clarify policy on off-street parking requirements for new apartment and condominium buildings in the Rosslyn-Ballston and Jefferson Davis Metro corridors, staff hosted a series of outreach events to speak with the broader public about the issue and update them on the Working Group's progress.

As part of the process, the County hosted two public open houses, and set up an online comment form that went live on Friday, December 16th.

In addition, County Staff hosted one small group discussion on December 14th to gain feedback and insights from key stakeholders within and adjacent to the Metro Corridors. Staff drew up a list of potential participants based on their knowledge of who in the county cares about parking issues or who have somehow been part of development review and parking discussions in the past. The individuals who attended came from that list. These notes capture the discussion at that small-group meeting.

Bonnie Parker opened the meeting by welcoming everyone, thanking them for their time, and asking each person to introduce him or herself.

Staff Presentation

Stephen Crim made a presentation of the Working Group's effort to date. See his presentation slides and notes below. His major points were:

- The Working Group has been established to work with staff on creating a clear and consistent policy for granting approval of parking at multi-family buildings proposed for development in the Rosslyn-Ballston and Jefferson Davis Corridors through the Site Plan and Unified Commercial Mixed Use Development permit process.
- Years of policy creation with public engagement, as well as the County's zoning ordinance, underpin the Working Group's effort and inform what the Group is producing.
- The Working Group is made up of individuals who represent a diversity of civic groups, industry groups, and Arlington's official commissions.
- Working Group members have developed a set of six principles to guide policy formation.
- Staff have shared with the Working Group information on parking policy in cities around the United States, and Stephen shared details about recent reforms in the District of Columbia and Alexandria as reference points.

- The Working Group is considering eight “policy strategies” which we can divide into three categories:
 - Reductions based on the project’s characteristics (presence of income-targeted units, on-site and off-site shared parking arrangements, as well as relief for small or difficult sites).
 - Reductions based on what’s available around the site (transit service, bike friendliness or “bikeability,” and walk friendliness or “walkability”).
 - Services and amenities that promote biking, walking, transit use, and car-sharing or bike-sharing. Stephen made a point of differentiating between Arlington’s current policy, which requires all development to make some of these services and amenities available, and a future policy in which developers would be able to build less parking in exchange for providing these services and amenities.

Q&A/Discussion

Bonnie then began facilitating questions and answers, as well as discussion, with participants.

A few participants offered that the community would benefit from data to support the Working Group’s effort. Experiential data, or data that shows what is being experienced would be helpful, with the County’s findings that garage occupancy is no more than 80% in site plan buildings helpful in particular. However, one participant said that reports on garage occupancy and parking oversupply do not ring true because of his experience with on-street parking in his neighborhood. In his experience, on-street parking has become harder to get and he believes that “people are parking wherever they can.”

There was some discussion of demographics among County residents and how age and car-ownership are related. Some participants asserted that young people today simply don’t want cars, while others either said that this assertion is untrue or that as these people age, they will want a car.

A participant who manages residential property in the Metro Corridors shared that in his experience, transportation demand management techniques do have the ability to impact mode choice and vehicle use, but that car ownership in his buildings has not dropped much over the years. He made the point that vehicle use is not the same thing as vehicle ownership, and that people who don’t drive to work still drive on the weekends. Furthermore, he asserted that while a developer can influence car use, they cannot influence car ownership with transportation demand management. As evidence, he shared that when he has walked through the garages in his buildings on weekend mornings, most of the cars are not in the garage because their owners are out driving them. Another participant emphasized that some families are dual-income households with two cars.

In addition to offering data, a participant offered that the County would do well to explain the reasons why the County is undertaking this policy-making process. His interpretation of Stephen’s presentation was that the County is going through this process in order to save developers money, a rationale that he believes will not be convincing for most in the community. In his opinion, community members may be engaged when County staff explain that this policy is a way to further the County’s affordable housing goals. Another participant shared that she heard staff mention other rationales for the policy that is to be created. For example, staff did mention that one of the Working Group’s guiding principles mentions how reducing parking supply will lead to reduced driving in the County. This participant thought that the

County should explain more vigorously the connections to transit and road-infrastructure use that parking policy has.

Other participants shared their impression that on-street parking is difficult to find in their neighborhoods and when shopping. One said that in his neighborhood it is difficult to find parking on a weekday evening after 7:30 PM. In response, a participant shared that there are really two aspects of the discussion in which the people in the room were engaging: off-street and on-street parking, and that there was a disconnect between the two in the conversation. One participant repeatedly questioned why there is a connection between parking at buildings and some residents' concern about finding on-street spaces.

Another resident concerned with on-street parking requested that the County change its policy for the Residential Permit Parking (RPP) program so that RPP restrictions could be put in place without a County study of parking occupancy on the street. This person called for a review of the RPP program and staff shared that such a review is forthcoming.

Participants covered other topics, such as parking for visitors and people who are providing services to residents. One asked for a requirement that buildings have common parking for workers coming to the building. Someone shared his belief that the proliferation of rentals through services like airBnB will only increase pressure for on-street parking.

A condominium resident encouraged the County to craft different rules for rental housing and ownership or condominium residences. His explanation is that condominiums are frequently home to high-income families that are downsizing, and that they own multiple vehicles. Furthermore, if we agree that less parking is needed for affordable housing units, then the corollary is that high-income housing requires more parking.

A property manager shared that in addition to resident parking, a property may set aside retail parking and parking for prospective residents visiting the property, meaning that a lot of parking could be taken up. Finally, one participant also mentioned that in addition to the number of spaces, the number of compact spaces is an issue; the County has allowed an increasing percentage of compact spaces, some of which are difficult for residents to use.

Bonnie asked the group which of the policy strategies presented were most useful or potentially impactful in the participants' opinions. One response was that transit overlay zones are important, and that the typical ¼-mile distance for transit is not always accurate since people will walk farther for transit. Another participant expressed interest in off-site shared parking, especially as an option for people who don't use their vehicle that often and who may be willing to park off-site in exchange for a cheaper price.

Another participant said that he liked an idea put forth by former Arlington County Board member, Chris Zimmerman, which was to give people dynamic information about parking availability, like an "Uber for parking."

Finally, one participant noted that most of the conversation was about the Rosslyn-Ballston corridor and encouraged the County to think differently about the Jefferson Davis corridor for a few reasons

- There is a greater mix of office and residential in the Jefferson Davis Corridor.

- There are more options for shared parking.
- There are constraints to parking supply; Crystal City is far from single-family neighborhoods and any supply that might be used as spill over.

One participant shared a prepared statement on the project, which is included at the end of this document.

Statement from the Ashton Heights Civic Association

Arlington's Latest Parking Philosophy

According to the County's description, the goal of the Residential Parking Working Group study is to "create recommendations for how County Development Review staff should consider proposals for parking in multi-family residential site plan developments".

The County has consistently reduced the amount of parking required for residential, office, and retail developments over the course of some years, significantly diminishing construction costs. When challenged on the basis of neighborhood spillover we have always been told that the number of parking spaces required by county ordinance is excess to needs. We have contested this assumption on the basis that there are no definitive studies that uphold it. Now the rationale is that the county wants to reduce driving and the more parking that is available the more cars will be attracted to the area. In other words, they believe that people moving into new apartment buildings will be forced to depend on mass transit, rather than buying and operating cars, because of a lack of parking.

Contrarily, the growth in population density, our troubled Metrorail, and government's tendency to give in to pressures imposed by new development seems likely to promote an accommodation of increased parking demand in the future. And, with lower parking ratios we are afraid that proposed regulations will be forwarded to burden adjacent neighborhoods with the problem. Those regulations may arise either from County or state government.

The AHCA is fully supportive of the urban village concept and encourages actions to reduce dependency on the automobile in our corridor, but we are concerned about a future of increasingly crowded streets and curbs in our neighborhood. Recent proposals to allow local AirBnBs are just one more potential contribution to this concern.

So, we would propose that any reduction of off-street parking demands for new development be accompanied by at least two resolutions:

1. A promise that no parking offsets be contemplated for neighborhoods. This would include denying issuance of temporary or permanent parking permits to multi-family residents.
2. A change in zoning procedures that permits any neighborhood to rezone their street as permit-only based simply on the strength of a petition signed by the majority of residents of that street.