

**Westside Development Code Workshop II
August 31, 2011**

Parking Workshop Topic

1. Q: How does shared parking work within mixed use?
A: Shared parking within a mixed- use project works primarily between the commercial uses on site and/or in conjunction with other commercial uses off site. Residential typically has dedicated parking, such as condominiums. Residential apartments may have a shared approach to parking.
2. Q: Shared Parking – why only 20% reduction? How to know 20% out of (10%-30% range?)
A: It's determined through study at the time of a project.
Note: Nelson Nygard does not recommend a cap to reduction in shared parking
3. Q: How does mixed use work with private parking lots (instead of public. There are none on Westside)
A: Would use a new requirement for private parking to be publicly available during other hours (see parking study). May do what is cost effective. There may be a lot at some time in the future. Range of recommendations is for long term. More sites specific measures can be done for site-specific projects.
4. Q: When development densifies, will intensity push parking into available on-street parking? Vacancy rates seem low; time study from 8a-8p does not reflect late-night actual peak, it's very parked up at 11:00pm.
A: The intent of the parking management through the use permit is to make sure that the shared and/or off site parking facilities are efficient and practical in order to prevent potential overspill into the neighborhoods. However, if it were to occur, it is highly unlikely that overspill would occur during the late night peak parking of the neighborhood since that is when most businesses are closed.
5. Q: How reduce commercial demand?
A: Businesses can do TDM programs. Commercial parking to be made available for public parking, not residential.
Potential TDMs
 - Public parking alternatives
 - Allow for small lot development without parking
 - Parking Survey during night hours when residential is most impacted.
 - Consider guest parking with reduced standard
 - Get rid of garage requirements/replace with housingB: Alternative transportation (due to price of parking spaces),
 - Car share
 - Transit passes
 - Transit incentives

- Provide alts. for incentives for alternative transportation – bike lockers, etc.

Workshop participant comments:

6. Don't like neighborhood spill over – contradictory to offer residential permit to restrict it.
7. Lots of development will occur on smaller lots. Too much height.
8. Would like parking district /impact fee for public parking supply.
9. Need public lots to alleviate neighborhood spillover/height pressure.
10. If reduce ¼ guest parking space, then will have to figure out guest parking.
11. Parking on the Avenue is wide open during the day. There is some flexibility.
12. Get rid of residential garage requirement. Use it to house people.
13. There are 7 parking spaces per car in the city. Parking is expensive between \$5-\$30K. Let's use the money for alternate transportation instead – car share; bikes; transit availability.
14. The Plan will bring a lot of expenses. Takes away the right of people to build parking. Restrict parking supply with permits, etc. Expensive for business with TDM Programs. Like San Francisco no housing market for units with 1 car space (wrong market). Developer will build wrong housing type. Will drive out business with future fee; permit costs for guests etc., + demand for future parking structures will be costly.
15. Need to figure out reasonable parking standards. No Negative Impact spilling over the neighborhoods.
16. What is the parking standard of the Wave? It's inadequate
17. Support 1 car garage, 2-car approach – (driveway) carports with charging abilities.
18. Supports reduce parking standards. People are using garage for storage and parking on street. Higher Standard = Greater impact to affordability.
19. What do minimum standards mean?

Olive Avenue Industrial Workshop Topic

20. Q: MXD zone would only apply to frontage?
A: Yes

21. Q: What are setback requirement on Olive?

A: Narrower on Olive than Avenue wider sidewalks to create space.

Workshop participant comments:

22. Like MXD for better frontage on the street. Don't agree with T5.5 on the street or additional height of SD – Zone. Height needs to consider neighborhood adjacency. Establish other SD-Zones with lower height requirement depending on neighborhood.

23. SD – Districts are meant to be just that – more surgical requirements. Like idea of several special districts for different areas of Westside industrial.

24. Industrial users don't build height in "stories" like other uses. Take into consideration what uses are there so don't downzone operation that may need height envelope for their operations.

25. Focus is off for MXD. Supposed to be about addressing street relationship/not height thing.

26. Address difference between Industrial and Retail. Define it.

27. Open space standard for industrial. Wants industrial park open space (could do slip-lane etc.)

Stanley Town Center Workshop Vision Exercise

28. Urban Design with open space; Thoroughfare etc. are good. Good direction is viable solution

29. Likes central parking; open up shared parking opportunity.

30. Connectivity on Cedar Street needs to happen – like more green space.

31. Like Transit Center. Maybe add Park-N-Ride; terminus at Stanley.

32. Prefers Gateway Square versus Big Box, i.e. ground floor retail better than big box – massing, etc.

33. Likes design plan with street layout with Stanley "swoop"; like street next to park but no substitute for more open space; shouldn't need additional buffer for school because school should be open.

34. Regional Parking Plan – Shared parking

35. Open up school not substitute for Open Space

36. Likes connectivity, transit center

37. Concerned about retail. Retailers 3, 5-mile market circles won't have purchase power for big box. Retail District option may have buying power.
36. Westside pool should be integrated into plan; Civic use; medical center
37. Look at balance when giving up industrial jobs on Selby.
38. Likes Stanley (dog leg version; increase size of green space; extend dog leg to Cameron Street
39. Transit center good
40. Joint use does not address park issues; schools have limited time for use due to other activities green space not conducive to BBQ activities
41. Commercial not good next to residential
42. Green Space concept too small/not usable
43. Use in-lieu fees for parking. Move transit to make bigger green space
44. Likes Transit Center
45. Traffic – need better for bikes
46. Want parks (5 acres, not small lots/linear parks)
47. Needs bike lanes
48. Where are “complete” streets
49. Alternate ideas for Cameron
 - Bike boulevard on Master Plan/Preferred route for bikes
 - Transit center with bike lockers
 - Green Aesthetic, place parks away from cars (protected)
 - Heavy trees, larger space
50. Kellogg Street site is not as large as this space

Retail Frontage Nodes Workshop Topic

51. Lower T4.11 in the neighborhoods.
52. Not in favor of reducing General Plan (GP) intensity. We worked a long time on GP to meet RHNA etc.

- 53. Not in favor of Dakota downzone across the street is already built out.
- 54. Support option #2 → remove Node at Vince/Lewis.
- 55. Agrees with #1; Agrees with #2; Drop T.4.11 (2-3 stories) in neighborhood. Don't dump density on the Westside. Density needs more study on neighborhood transition.

Corridor Nodes/Heights Workshop Topic

- 56. Supports G.P.A.
- 57. #3 from Historical perspective -> need the view. Its massive views are historic.
- 58. Supports #2 -> because its location of Historic District. Same for Simpson
- 59. Take T.4.11 down to 2 stories in neighborhood.
- 60. Opposes #3 G.P.A. -> big effort needs to stay.
- 61. Either way on #1 & #2 will go with consensus.
- 62. If have smaller dwelling units -> need less space/heights.
- 64. Density bonus needs to be discussed because it adds to heights.
- 65. Conflicting Parks Standards in Code.

Developing EIR Alternatives Workshop Topic

- 66. No to Alternative #1 and #3
- 67. EIR Alternative to include Options #2 & #3
- 68. Stick to Code as is
- 69. Yes on #1
- 70. #2 possibly
- 71. Dropt T4.11 in neighborhood, & T5.5 2 story
- 72. Transition against adjacent zones
- 73. Yes to #3 keep 360° view
- 74. Yes to #2
- 75. No to #3; 1 or 2 maybe
- 76. What is density? Business/people
- 77. Limit size of unit 3 for density

78. No to #3?

—