**Measure D Working Group Goals**

**Potential Goals for Amending Measure D Requirements**

a. Update policy to be in line with other Bay Area communities (we’re out of sync)

b. Change parking requirements to be adopted by Council rather than voter initiative (we are one of the only communities that regulates parking through a voter initiative)

c. Reduce VMT
   i. Enhance neighborhood vitality by creating a safe environment for pedestrians and bicyclists.
   ii. Increase mobility choices for all income levels.
   iii. Improve transit services.
   iv. Encourage alternative modes of transportation through better infrastructure, bike parking, and TDM measures.

d. Enable housing development and density
   i. Reduce housing construction cost.
   ii. Maximize return on housing investment.
   iii. Incentivize the construction of more affordable housing options.
   iv. Encourage the development of a diverse, varied housing stock (developers currently have a disincentive to build small units)
   v. Incentivize senior housing

e. Incentivize redevelopment
   i. Foster economic activity, especially on San Pablo and Solano Avenues.
   ii. Redevelop underutilized land, for example on Adams and Kains street.

**Options**

1. **Keep Measure D**

   **Pros:**
   - Serves site specific needs.
   - Convenience for vehicles use.
   - Reduced conflict points with traffic way.
   - Avoid traffic congestion and spillover from on-street parking.
   - Off-street parking provides shelter in bad weather.

   **Cons:**
   - Parking spaces and access takes a large portion of the development land.
   - Increases housing cost.
   - Used for specific business that might be unoccupied otherwise. (Ex: Mechanics bank parking lot used for community parking.)
   - Auto-oriented policy that eliminates the possibility of using other modes of transportation, which is not consistent with the goals of Smart Growth or Climate Action Plan.
   - Decreases the financial feasibility of transit-oriented development.
   - An expensive underutilized space used as a storage area in many cases.
Variations to be discussed:

The working group is recommending variations for amending Measure D to let the City Council adjust, and the voters approve new parking standards to be provided on a gross floor area basis for residential areas. Given the city’s proximity to transit e.g. units close to San Pablo Ave., demographics of prospective users, implementation of Transportation Demand Management programs, and current number of owners paying fees in lieu of minimum parking requirement, variations will be best executed if parking requirement is consistent with residential unit’s square footage.

There are three main categories with size parameters for each category.

- New construction
  - Very Small - less than 240 sq. ft.
  - Small - less than 700 sq. ft. (one bedroom)
  - Medium - more than 700 sq. ft.
  - Large - four bedrooms

- Additions and/or retrofits
  - 700 sq. ft. or greater

- Second units
  - Max. 650 sq. ft.
Recommended minimum and maximum parking requirements are detailed in the matrix below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Additions/Multi-Family</th>
<th>Minimum Parking Requirement</th>
<th>Maximum Parking Requirement</th>
<th>Pros</th>
<th>Cons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Very small units       | 0                            | 0                           | • Provide diverse housing for all income levels.  
| (less than 240 sq. ft.)|                              |                             | • Encourage other modes of transportation. | Difficulty in finding parking alternatives. |
| Small units            | One                          | No more than one            | • Reduce car ownership and VMT  
| (less than 700 sq. ft. (one bedroom)) | |                             | • Housing affordability. | Difficulty in finding parking alternatives. |
| Medium units           | One                          | No more than two            | Accommodate owners' choice of paying for an extra parking space. | Increase construction cost for the second parking space |
| (more than 700 sq. ft. to XXXX sq. ft.) | | | | |
| Large units            | Two                          | No more than two            | Prevent congestion in front of large units. | Increase construction cost for the second parking space |
| (four bedrooms)        | | | | |
| New Construction       |                              |                             | Cost effective for land utilization to contain new needs. | Difficulty in finding parking alternatives. |
| New Single Family      | Two                          | No more than two            | | |
| Residential Construction only | | | | |
| Secondary Units        | 0                            | 0                           | • Secondary units are more affordable with higher housing density.  
| Based on 650 sq. ft. units | |                             | • Pedestrian friendly with anticipated increased ridership. | Difficulty in finding parking alternatives. |
**Solutions complementary to amending Measure D:**
Meeting parking requirements may vary from site to site; this is why amending Measure D requires including a variety of parking solutions that may change according to the development’s location and surrounding land uses. Some options are open for discussion in the below matrix. The information presented aims to develop a dialogue that can lead to decision making with City Council regarding placing amending Measure D on the 2014 ballots, and to ensure that updating parking requirements is to be achieved in context of broader City goals and Zoning Ordinance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Solutions</th>
<th>Pros</th>
<th>Cons</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
<th>Preference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| On-Street Parking (with residential parking permits) | • Cheaper per space parking by 25%  
• One space may substitute two off-street parking spaces.  
• Help stimulate a pedestrian and bicycle friendly neighborhood.  
• Help stimulate greener streetscape.  
• Provides safety buffer for pedestrian from street traffic.  
• Calms street traffic.  
• Enhance economy of retail development (Solano and San Pablo)  
• Reduce the space devoted to parking. | • Generate congestion. (How many on-street parking will result)  
• Takes up spaces within the public right of way.  
• Extra cost for residents to park on street. (Similar cases apply $40-80 annual fees)  
• Inconvenient for visitors and service vehicles. | Can be applied in some parts of R-3 Zoning District | Yes/No     |
| Example                            | Residents of the street/neighborhood would have to petition the City Council for review and approval of parking permits including the desire and need for permit parking, bearing the costs associated with such a system, demonstrate the extent to which legal on-street parking spaces are occupied by motor vehicles, the extent to which vehicles parking in the area during the proposed parking restriction are vehicles belonging to non-residents rather than residents, etc. (See Section 9-12 of the Permit Parking of the Albany Municipal Code). | | | |
| Shared parking (with bicycle parking facilities) | • Reduce the amounts of land devoted to parking in the neighborhood.  
• Help stimulate a pedestrian and bicycle friendly neighborhood.  
• Efficient use of land so more development area is available.  
• Stimulate use of transit system. | • Shared parking agreements are required.  
• Shared access agreements are required.  
• Potentially inconvenient for individual businesses. | Can be applied in some parts of R--- | Yes/No     |
<p>| Example                            | Mechanics Bank underutilized parking lot could be used to serve surrounding residents at Washington &amp; Kains Ave. | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unbundled Parking</th>
<th></th>
<th>Proximity to transit or an alternate mobility is an important factor that might not exist in all zones.</th>
<th>Can be applied in some parts of R—</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Example</strong></td>
<td>A homeowner going through the Design Review process who is unable to provide the second off-street parking space pays an in-lieu fee, regardless of household behaviors.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Parking permits with Group Transit Passes |  | Extra cost and undesired taxes for residents to park.  
|                      |                      | Inconvenience for visitors and service vehicles.  
|                      |                      | Requires extra work for enforcement.  
|                      |                      | Takes time for residents to familiarize that might result in citations and unsatisfaction.  
|                      |                      | AC Transit is sometimes slow and unreliable. |
| **Example**      | AC Transit has agreements with UC Berkeley, City of Berkeley and Ironhorse apartments in Oakland of $77 annual fees for transit passes. |
| Car-Sharing       |  | Require multiple locations across the city to provide coverage to their users. |
| **Example**      | The City could create an arrangement with City Car Share and designate parking spaces for car share vehicles on Solano Ave. |