In the Spring of 2010, a graduate class at San José State University in Urban and Regional Planning teamed up with the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) to study parking at transit-oriented development (TOD) residential projects in the southern portion of the San Francisco Bay Area. By observing the parking utilization rates at 12 housing developments near VTA light rail and Caltrain stations, this collaborative research effort produced valuable, local evidence that the parking supply at projects of this type exceeds actual demand. And in corroborating recent research which demonstrated that other TOD residential properties in the Bay Area are also “over-parked” (Cervero 2009), the study provides useful evidence to help inform decision makers that less parking can and ought to be required for housing projects that are located near rail transit service.

This article presents a summary of the objective, methodology, key findings, and policy implications of this collaborative research project. A full description of the project methodology, local background, survey data, research findings, and policy implications is presented in the Technical Report dated November 2010, available online (see below for web address).

**PROJECT OBJECTIVE AND METHODOLOGY**

The intent of this research project is to corroborate the findings of other research on the topic and provide evidence that reduced parking requirements may be feasible in Santa Clara County. If the surveys demonstrate lower actual parking utilization than current parking supply, it would indicate that local jurisdictions with land-use control surrounding rail transit stations could reduce their parking requirement standards. This reduction in parking requirements could have the effect of reducing TOD construction costs and reducing the footprint of TOD development projects to make land available for other and better uses.

An initial literature review was conducted to collate existing research related to parking utilization and demand. The results from the literature review were used to determine best practices in estimating parking demand, identify local parking requirements in the study area, and develop a parking survey work plan. Parking literature often refers to a critical threshold being
reached around 85 percent utilization—above this point, parking supply is perceived to be full by users, and spillover or illegal parking may occur. From a methodological perspective, if the observed parking utilization rates at TOD residential properties in the County were found to be significantly lower than 85 percent, then the parking demand at these sites could be estimated from the observed rates without additional surveys. However, if the observed utilization rates were found to be significantly higher than 85 percent, then more extensive surveys would be needed to estimate the total parking demand because parking overflow is likely. In either case, the use of parking utilization surveys would answer the key research question of whether TOD residential projects in Santa Clara County are “over-parked,” because they would determine whether the usage rates are above or below 85 percent. Therefore, the Research Team proceeded with on-the-ground parking surveys, collecting a range of parking-related data from 12 TOD residential properties that met the selection criteria listed in Box 1. The data collected by the Research Team were analyzed in a variety of ways, and the key findings are presented in this article.

KEY RESEARCH FINDINGS

All 12 TOD residential properties offer more parking than residents need and actually use. Each of the survey sites has significant unused parking, by as little as 17 percent and as much as 39 percent; overall, out of the total parking spaces (9,751 supplied) about 26 percent of them were not utilized (2,496 unused) at the time of the on-the-ground surveys. Table 1 shows that on average only about 1.3 spaces are needed per dwelling unit in a TOD residential site in Santa Clara County, while the average parking supply rate was 1.7 for the survey sites (calculated from 9,751 total supplied spaces for 5,801 total dwelling units). The fact that the parking supply rate is found higher than the parking demand rate for all 12 sites (22 percent higher on average) indicates that more parking is provided than is actually needed.

Since parking requirements for residential developments are set by local zoning requirements, local parking requirements have clearly contributed to the large amount of parking supplied at the residential development sites surveyed. The 2,496 unused parking spaces in 12 residential sites lead the Research Team to conclude that parking facilities at TOD residential projects in Santa Clara County may be underutilized. This finding suggests that local parking code requirements for TOD residential properties in Santa Clara County, and other similar locations, could be reduced by as much as 26 percent.

Based on the observed peak parking utilization, the parking demand rates for the 12 TOD survey sites are near the bottom of the range of required parking supply levels for municipalities across Santa Clara County (see Figure 1), which in some cases may exceed 2.5 parking spaces per dwelling unit under current local zoning requirements. This research project shows that parking demand at residences within one-half mile of a rail station is less than what current zoning codes require. As such, many Santa Clara County municipalities could reduce their residential parking requirements significantly without the risk of “underparking” a TOD residential site.

1. This result for Santa Clara County TOD sites is comparable to the average parking demand rate of 1.2 space per dwelling unit for other San Francisco Bay Area TOD sites studied by Robert Cervero in 2009 (see Table 2.1 in the Technical Report).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BOX 1 TOD Residential Project Survey Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Within ½ mile of a rail transit station</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Minimum residential occupancy of 85 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Over one year old</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Free parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Restricted/designated parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Open surface parking or podium garage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• At least 80 units or 100 parking spaces</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
POLICY IMPLICATIONS

Reduce Costs of Unused Parking

Since unused parking supply consumes land, money, and other resources in its construction and maintenance, reduction in parking requirements for TOD residential projects could benefit both local municipalities and developers alike. Constructing parking facilities increases costs for developers and proves inefficient for the municipality when a large proportion of a development site is unused. There are potential cost savings that could be garnered if parking requirements are reduced to levels suggested by the utilization data presented in this study. The savings in development costs could then be used to support other enhancements to projects, which may be desired by the local agency and the community.

Simplify Local Parking Requirements

Many municipalities in Santa Clara County have their own unique way of granting reduced parking requirements for residences near transit stations. In the majority of cases, the process requires case-by-case decision making (such as conditional use permits) or a previously completed planning effort (such as a Specific Plan). In several jurisdictions, reductions can only be granted through issuance of a variance or in conjunction with the site developer’s participation in and promotion of transportation demand management (TDM) programs.

Providing reduced parking requirements for TOD residential sites directly into the zoning code would save municipalities the staff time and resources required for additional permitting efforts. Additionally, this form of regulation would likely be seen as beneficial in the development community, as it would allow for a greater measure of predictability and simplicity in determining the costs associated with developing a residential site. Such a benefit may even result in an increased number of TOD residential projects in municipalities that simplify the parking requirements in such a manner.

FIGURE 1 Parking Utilization Rates for Surveyed Sites Compared to Local Zoning Requirements
Future Transit Expansion

Several new transit projects are planned for Santa Clara County in the coming years, notably several Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) lines and the BART extension to San José. The new transit lines will provide better transit service to many areas throughout Santa Clara County, including important destinations such as central business districts, hence providing residents the option to access these areas without driving. As more areas in Santa Clara County are connected by frequent, convenient transit service, there will be new opportunities for residents to take advantage of the accessibility and convenience that TOD residential projects offer, and more developments should be able to reduce their parking supply.

This research has shown that TOD residential sites, which meet the criteria in Box 1 and are near rail stations in Santa Clara County, are over-parked. This reasoning could be further expanded to suggest that TOD residential projects near new BRT transit stations could also have similarly reduced parking demand. If the quality of BRT service in terms of convenience and comfort is comparable to rail service, then there is the potential to reduce parking requirements for TOD residential sites near BRT stations as well.

Better Land Use and Urban Form

Municipalities could expect positive impacts from decreasing parking ratios for TOD residential projects. Land would be more efficiently used by making it available for additional housing or enhanced community amenities. Decreasing parking ratios from 2.2 to 1.1—while holding other

### TABLE 1 Parking Survey Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Housing Total Units</th>
<th>Occupied Units</th>
<th>Parking Total Spaces</th>
<th>Utilized Spaces</th>
<th>Unused Spaces</th>
<th>Parking Utilization Ratio</th>
<th>Parking Demand Rate</th>
<th>Parking Supply Rate</th>
<th>Over Supply (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Avalon at Creekside</td>
<td>MV</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Domicilio</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>568</td>
<td>439</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Mansion Grove</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>924</td>
<td>832</td>
<td>1,654</td>
<td>1,282</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. North Park</td>
<td>SJ</td>
<td>2,760</td>
<td>2,622</td>
<td>4,605</td>
<td>3,409</td>
<td>1,196</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Kensington Place</td>
<td>SU</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. City Heights*</td>
<td>SJ</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Paseo Plaza</td>
<td>SJ</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Paseo Villas</td>
<td>SJ</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Skyline at Tamien</td>
<td>SJ</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Ohlone Chynoweth Commons</td>
<td>SJ</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Almaden Lake Village</td>
<td>SJ</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Monte Vista</td>
<td>SJ</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>523</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total                    |       | 5,801               | 5,522          | 9,751               | 7,255           | 2,496        |                          |                     |                  |                 |
| Average                  |       | 483                 | 460            | 813                 | 605             | 208          | 0.74                     | 1.31                | 1.68             | 22              |
| Std. Dev.                |       | 751                 | 709            | 1,258               | 936             | 324          | 0.07                     |                     |                  |                 |

Notes
MV = Mountain View | SC = Santa Clara | SJ = San José | SU = Sunnyvale
* Site 11 has an occupancy rate of 75% (it was the only survey site with an occupancy rate less than 90%). The total number of housing units and parking spaces were adjusted for Site 11 to reflect an occupancy rate of 100%.
factors constant—increases the potential for building more units by 20 to 33 percent (Arrington & Cervero 2008). Reducing parking ratios should result in lower construction costs, greater housing production, higher transit ridership, and improved overall physical form and performance of residential developments (Arrington & Cervero 2008, 48-51).

Another implication of lowered parking ratios relates to urban form. By reducing the amount of parking (especially surface parking) required at a site, the overall physical form on residential properties can be improved to make them more inviting and pedestrian friendly, and thus more “livable.” Putting lots of surface parking between housing units and the adjacent roads and walking paths typically creates barriers to walkability.

AREAS OF FURTHER RESEARCH

Mixed-use developments and TOD projects present an excellent opportunity for shared-parking situations, which could increase the efficiency of parking facilities that serve these types of developments. Depending on the time of day, shared parking between residents and commercial business patrons enables the use of spaces that might otherwise be unused. If a mixed-use development is located within one-half mile of a transit station, then overall parking could be reduced and shared across all land uses. By integrating commercial and residential parking, the overall parking supply will be more efficiently used. Future research on shared parking in TOD projects in Santa Clara would be useful in planning and permitting TOD projects.

BOX 2 Parking Utilization Ratios for Survey Sites

As noted earlier in this article, parking literature often refers to a critical threshold around 85 percent utilization, above which point parking supply is perceived to be full by users and spillover or illegal parking may occur. This figure shows that the parking utilization rates for all survey sites were below this critical threshold of 85 percent. Therefore, the observed parking utilization can be considered to represent the total parking demand for the surveyed sites.

![Bar chart showing parking utilization ratios for survey sites](chart.png)
TOD residential properties with reduced parking ratios should result in higher transit ridership. Municipalities could then offer an incentive to private developers in the form of reduced traffic-related impact fees. The rationale would be that since these TOD residential projects generate fewer vehicle trips, their associated fair-share contribution to roadway traffic impacts could be lowered. Future research studies could be conducted to verify that people in Santa Clara County who choose to live in TOD residential properties drive less often and have fewer cars, thereby reducing their demand for parking.

The Research Team developed a research work plan for estimating parking demand using stated-preference user surveys. For reference in future research, a methodology for conducting a user survey is included in Appendix C of the final research report for parties who may wish to estimate the total residential parking demand at TOD sites, particularly for those TOD residential projects that exhibit very high parking utilization.

FURTHER READING


POLICY IMPLICATIONS SUMMARY

- Lowered construction costs associated with reduced required parking could incentivize more TOD residential projects and support other enhancements to projects desired by the local agency and the community. The cost of constructing parking facilities often exceeds $30,000 per space in a garage and about $5,000 per space for surface lots. Further savings could be achieved by avoiding the cost of maintaining parking spaces that are not fully utilized.

- Simplifying local parking requirements would save municipalities staff time and resources. And by providing greater predictability, developers might pursue TOD residential projects in cities that simplify parking requirements.

- As more areas in Santa Clara County are connected by frequent, convenient transit service, there will be new opportunities for residents to take advantage of the accessibility and convenience that TOD residential projects offer, and more developments should be able to reduce their parking supply. TOD residential projects near new BRT transit stations could also have similarly reduced parking demand.

- By reducing the amount of parking (especially surface parking) required at a site, the overall physical form on residential properties can be improved to make them more inviting and pedestrian friendly, and thus more “livable.”
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