MACHINE TRANSCRIPT · CORAGGIO CONSULTING

Fairfax County Board of Supervisors Land Use Committee, Tuesday, February 14, 2023

Date	Tuesday, February 14, 2023
Place	Fairfax County Board of Supervisors, Virginia
Length	39m (video)

- Official meeting video (Fairfax County): https://video.fairfaxcounty.gov/player/clip/2745
- Official Board of Supervisors page (Fairfax County): https://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/boardofsupervisors/

> Machine transcript (speech-to-text) produced by Coraggio Consulting. Not an official county record. Names and numbers may be misspelled; check the video at the timestamp before quoting.

Speech-to-text: whisper.cpp, model large-v3-turbo. Produced 2026-11-04. Each paragraph starts with its time [HH:MM:SS] in the meeting video.

[00:00:05] Good afternoon. I am going to call the Land Use Policy Committee to order, and Chairman McKay is going to have a motion to get us started. I do have one. As you all can see, Supervisor Palchuk will be participating remotely in this Land Use Policy Committee meeting for a medical reason. I'll ask Supervisor Palchuk to identify herself for the record and identify her general location. Supervisor Palchuk. Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairman. Supervisor Dalia Palchuk here participating remotely from my home in the Providence District.

[00:00:38] Thank you, Supervisor Palchuk. At this time, I move that the Land Use Policy Committee certify that the voice of the remotely participating members, Supervisor Palchuk, can be heard by all persons assembled here in the Government Center, and I further move that this committee confirm that such remote participation by Supervisor Palchuk fully conforms with the Board's policy for remote participation in meetings.

[00:00:57] I'd be happy to second that motion. Is there discussion on the motion? Seen and hearing none. All those in favor of the motion, please say aye. Aye. Any opposed say nay any abstentions that motion carries mr. Chairman. Thank you very much Supervisor Smith. Thank you. Mr. Chairman for our land use policy committee today We were going to have a second presentation, but we weren't quite ready So if you notice your agenda, we put aside an hour for this discussion That doesn't mean you need to take the whole

hour, but I wanted you to understand, you know How we had planned the meeting and so with that we have our

[00:01:34] Meeting summary from the last meeting. If I don't see any corrections or additions, we will take that as accepted. And I am going to turn it over to Mike to start. Thank you. Thank you very much. Good afternoon, everyone. I'm Michael Davis. I'm with the county's Land Development Services Department. I have a bevy of staff people with me today. Rachel Flynn, Deputy County Executive, Bill Hicks, Director of Land Development Services, Tracy Strunk, Director of Planning and Development, Matt Hanson, Hayden Cotting.

[00:02:07] and david stoner leslie johnson bill malin and austin who will be co-presenting with me today in november 2022 we met with the board to provide an update of our progress on the parking reimagined initiative in conjunction with that discussion we released the full draft of changes to article six of the zoning ordinance as we discussed it's our intent to repeal the current ordinance language and replace it with new language today we'll discuss project activities and summarize proposed revisions to article six since the november release of the ordinance since november staff has continued to engage with the community on the project, conducting three public outreach open

[00:02:45] houses and meeting with EQAC to present and discuss the Article 6 proposals. With the November release of the full ordinance text, staff added the public input application to the project website to get more specific input from the community. When we closed this portal on February 2nd, we had the general breakdown of responses. Project goes too far, opposed, 35 responses. Project doesn't do enough, 19 responses. Favorable to project, 37 responses. And we had 11 responses that were a little unclear or had other comments. Staff also added an informational video to our website,

[00:03:21] which has 327 views on YouTube. Further, staff has continued to edit and modify the draft language, incorporating feedback from the public, as well as through consultations with staff, stakeholder groups, and our consultant. The community will continue to be able to provide comments or a project email. This project was initiated in August of 2021. It has evolved with input provided by our consulting team, regional and national municipality experiences, staff discussions, research and analysis, and importantly, community feedback. More than 70 meetings open to

[00:03:57] the public and with members of the community occurred during this project. Further, a project work group made up of members of the community was formed for the project to get their feedback on our proposals together this community engagement led to significant proposals including enhancing accessibility provisions for parking and loading areas providing reduced parking for meeting or enhancing associated environmental benefits additional accommodation for electric vehicle parking defining areas to be included in the tiered framework and other elements of the proposed revisions we have had some community concerns about the project and these fell into five general themes the effect this project

[00:04:36] will have on the environment will be discussed in further detail in the presentation Concerns were expressed that the proposed bicycle requirements are not adequate. Updates will be discussed. Our goal with this project was codification of a requirement. We will continue to evaluate possible enhancements to the regulations.

[00:04:54] Revisions of the authority of the Director of Land Development Services to approve parking adjustments will be discussed in detail. Off-site or spillover parking concerns have been raised by the

community throughout the project discussions. Much of the feedback was focused on residential parking impacts.

[00:05:10] This issue is complex and not directly related to supplied parking. In site surveys and other research, a variety of factors contribute to residential spillover parking. Many multifamily developments have monthly fees for parking for each vehicle, and multifamily and townhouse communities restrict the number of vehicles that can be parked for each unit.

[00:05:30] There are bans on commercial vehicle parking in these communities, and residents who have little access to parking within the community own multiple vehicles. Staff has a toolbox to administer public on-street parking, and we should not simply rely on private development to build excessive parking capacity that degrades our communities and doesn't solve parking issues.

[00:05:50] Some in the community have characterized this project as a developer giveaway. However, the reduction of parking rates does not create additional density or floor area ratio. These are either given by right as part of the property zoning, or it can be increased by the board through a public hearing.

[00:06:06] As discussed in this presentation, there are clear community benefits to reducing parking requirements. When this project was initiated, we identified some core community values that we intended to address. The proposed changes to Article 6 create broad opportunities to positively support the goals of One Fairfax, Resilient Fairfax, and CCAB.

[00:06:26] There are no net environmental benefits gained from over-requiring parking. Lowering of minimum parking rates resulting in less required impervious surface countywide is an environmental benefit. One Fairfax promotes the equitable goal of creating a quality-built environment which accommodates anticipated growth and promotes housing and services for all people.

[00:06:48] Reducing parking requirements allows unneeded parking spaces to be repurposed to help create these environments. Creating opportunities for more housing, which lowers its overall price, as well as more affordable housing options, is a critical goal within the county. Minimum parking requirements play a role in limiting these options.

[00:07:05] The cost to provide parking has a direct effect on the ability to provide affordable housing. Residents pay for parking they do not need, and opportunities are lost to use that unneeded parking for better purposes. Further, dedicating land and structures to parking hinders the construction of more housing supply.

[00:07:23] Reducing the influence of parking enhances placemaking opportunities and helps to create better design sites where people want to be, such as the Cap 1 Development in Tysons, Reston Town Center, and the Mosaic District. By lowering parking requirements and implementing proposals such as pedestrian routes and requiring bicycle parking, we can promote safer sites where people feel comfortable using improved pedestrian infrastructure.

[00:07:47] This project supports county goals of environmental stewardship through both direct and indirect environmental benefits. Implementation of bicycle parking minimum requirements and standards as a new section of the zoning ordinance directly benefits CCAB Action 8A, which calls for the support, use, and improvement of bicycle infrastructure.

[00:08:06] The creation of a tiered parking framework, which reduces parking rates in densely populated areas and around transit hubs, supports CCAB strategies by promoting the use of existing and proposed public transportation. Lowering parking requirements decreases required parking infrastructure in the form of impervious surface across all portions of the county, while also creating opportunities to reduce heat island effects by converting surface parking to natural planting areas or areas with lower heat retention properties.

[00:08:33] The decreasing of impervious surface requirements reduces heat-generating land development activities and heat island effects, which supports both CCAB and resilient Fairfax strategies. A benefit of this project is the opportunity to reduce vehicle emissions. Reducing the influence of parking in high-density areas creates opportunities to build compact developments with quality pedestrian infrastructure that allows people to travel by non-vehicular modes to access goods, services, and employment.

[00:09:01] Further, the promotion of shared parking practices, which cut down on overall vehicle trips, helps to support CCAB strategies related to transportation demand management and smart growth. The ability to reduce parking requirements encourages the repurpose of surface parking areas that result in better stormwater management and mitigation.

[00:09:20] This also provides opportunities to reduce non-point source pollutions, which enter our ecosystem through stormwater runoff on surfaced areas. Lastly, we are proposing new parking adjustment options that allow for reductions in required parking in exchange for conservation or enhancement of green space and tree canopy.

[00:09:35] This supports CCAB and resilient fairfax strategies by promoting land development practices that protect and restore natural resources. The first three subsections of Article 6 discuss the general applicability of parking requirements, the design of parking lots and spaces, and applicable standards for calculating required parking.

[00:09:57] Significant proposed changes to the first three sections of Article 6 since we last met include the addition of provisions that would require the installation of dedicated pedestrian routes through parking areas that safely connect surrounding public walkways and accessible parkings to building entrances. This requirement would apply to larger redeveloping sites and new development.

[00:10:16] We have also modified language related to change in use, which makes it easier to determine when existing parking is adequate. In response to community feedback, we are also proposing to permit up to a 20% reduction and parking to accommodate for parking lot landscaping. Language has also been added to state that temporary outdoor uses don't have to identify parking as part of the county's permitting processes. And lastly, staff is proposing to remove parking requirements for outdoor dining areas. Subsection 6100.4 and 6100.5 include the base minimum rates for all uses identified in the zoning ordinance and the tiered framework. These have been available for the

[00:10:55] public since July of 2022. Since November, minor adjustments have been made to certain rates. To allow for greater flexibility during decision processes, ranges have been added for all uses and for each proposed tier. Community feedback throughout this project has indicated concerns regarding the availability of parking in single-family attached and multi-family communities.

[00:11:16] As a reminder, the current draft proposes the parking requirement for attached homes to retain the total rate of 2.7 spaces per unit, of which 0.7 spaces per unit are to be provided for dedicated visitor or shared use. Currently, townhouse parking or parking for a townhouse unit can be provided solely within a unit's garage or driveway or both. Staff is also proposing a minor variation process that will make it easier to consider additions to parking at older townhouse communities that may have met a previous lower parking requirement. With these changes, staff is seeking to balance the preservation of open space and community parking

[00:11:51] demand. The multifamily parking rate currently proposed is 1.3 spaces per unit as a base rate and a graduated rate per bedroom as we move through the parking tiered framework. The proposed rates are supported by national and local data on parking demand for multifamily uses. The county conducted a multifamily parking demand study in 2017 to support lower parking rates for development and transit station areas that were adopted by the board in 2018. Since then, more robust national studies have been completed that stratify average parking demand for this use by location,

[00:12:26] transit availability, and affordability. Or reduce the parking supply for a development site. Subsequent to discussions in November, staff has continued to evaluate the parameters of authority by the Director of Land Development Services to review and approve parking adjustments. The current ordinance allows some director authority to approve these. All adjustments, whether considered by the board or by staff and the director, require an official request to be prepared by a professional engineer and technical review by staff. The adjustment options in the ordinance have defined

[00:13:04] criteria that requires a demonstration of compliance to qualify for staff or board consideration. Procedurally, staff notifies the relevant member of the Board of Supervisors when an adjustment is submitted. In all proposals requiring board consideration, no public hearing is required. However, adjustments associated with land use actions will be included in public hearings on a land use proposal. Staff is proposing to modify the director's approval authority from a 60% adjustment to a 50% adjustment with a range of 30 to 60% to allow the board flexibility in deciding an appropriate percentage. There is no change

[00:13:41] expected in our notification procedures to board members. Additional changes to allowable adjustments proposed since November include all uses identified in the zoning ordinance are now integrated into the standard shared parking proposal. The previous proposal specifying mixed use and religious assembly adjustments is consolidated into the shared parking language. These reductions will continue to be allowed. The proposed adjustment for affordable housing proposals is modified to apply only to an entire affordable building rather than individual units within a market rate development. Establishing the adjustment threshold with an all-affordable building will allow consideration of the parking dynamics for the entirety of that type of development.

[00:14:21] Based on community input, additional proposed criteria for a public benefit parking adjustment, including qualifying open space and stormwater management elements, are added and would be subject to approval by the board. This subsection defines the vehicle loading requirements. This relates to loading docks and zones on private property. Changes since November include a lowering of the threshold gross building square footage for loading requirements from 25,000 square feet to 10,000 square feet with a range for consideration from 5,000 to 25,000 square feet. A requirement

[00:14:57] for receiving facilities for uses under 10,000 square feet is reintroduced. This area will provide flexible space for convenient delivery and pickup and can include reserved parking spaces, pull-off areas along the curb, areas within the building, or other facilities deemed appropriate by the Director of Land Development Services to encourage innovative approaches to loading.

[00:15:21] Establishing minimum bicycle requirements was envisioned from the outset of this project. Providing this is an important component to encourage bicycle usage further and offset auto parking demand. We're proposing these significant changes to the language. Provide the basis for determining required parking to be consistent with the baseline parking requirements in the tiered framework. Bicycle parking rates increase proportional to baseline requirements, unreduced by the tiered framework, or other reductions to auto parking. We remove the no minimum required option to, instead of two, to always require bike parking. The provision of

[00:15:57] bicycle spaces is an important feature of a multimodal transportation system requiring a minimum number of spaces. Staff will request the board to consider authorizing advertisement of public hearings in March of 2023 and will propose to repeal current Article 6 and replace it with new Article 6 language. Additional select provisions of the ordinance will also be proposed for modification to make them consistent with the changes to Article 6. With authorization in March, the current schedule is a public hearing at the Planning Commission on April 19th and a public hearing at the Board on June 6th. With our recommended changes, staff will also request a

[00:16:36] delayed effective date for implementation to allow for staff training and operational activities. For next steps in the project, staff will meet with the Planning Commission's Land Use Policy Review Committee on February 16th. We'll also continue discussions with environmental stakeholder groups and other stakeholders. Also, until the board acts on the proposal, the community will continue to have opportunities to comment on the proposed changes through the project website.

[00:17:02] And with that, our presentation is complete and we're ready to answer any questions you may have. Thank you, Michael. You know, as you can hear, we've had a lot of changes as this process has gone along and reacted to comments from the community. If you highlight your document, you'll see there's lots of areas in here where there will be ranges for us to make decisions on, and that gives us room for conversations with the community.

[00:17:30] There is one of the issues that's come up from the community is about landscaping and why are we doing this if we're not doing landscaping. So that's something I'd like Leslie Johnson to address. Thank you, Supervisor Smith. We are working on a, it's on the zoning ordinance amendment work program for this fiscal year, and we have on landscaping and screening. That's another, similar to parking, that's another provision of the ordinance that is kind of outdated, hasn't really been significantly looked at since the early 70s, 78, early 80s.

[00:18:08] one of those components deals with parking lot landscaping it deals with transitional screening and parking lot landscaping and we do have a consultant we are hoping we've done a lot of outreach with various groups so we've been kind of coming behind the parking folks and going to the various different groups we've met with EQAC where we have a meeting scheduled with the tree Commission coming up but this will take a look at some of the landscaping requirements for parking areas specifically so that's kind of why you know the parking reimagined is more about the rates and how we administer it

[00:18:45] and then we're following up with this landscaping and screening and they do you know dovetail and we are watching both closely to make sure we're in alignment thank you for that clarification and and you know in part of the presentation from staff one of the reductions are talking about is you could get an extra 20% reduction for landscaping. So I think these two things, you know, will work together hand in hand and have the information in the right places. With that, I am going, oh wait, sorry, one more thing. Yeah, sure. I really like that you've added language in there to help current townhouse communities find ways to add parking if they need to, because I know we've had

[00:19:23] some of them come to me. And so I think sometimes there's confusion with the community that you're going to change all our parking and make it worse. Well, something that's existing is existing. So I think that opportunity is really good. I'm sorry. No, that's fine. Thank you, Supervisor Smith. First, I want to thank staff because at the beginning of this, you talked about there being a lot of community outreach. You know, when I look at page one of the supporting document and read that to date more than 100 meetings have taken place, I mean, it's almost too hard to believe. And it's because a lot of folks here are spending a lot of time with the community,

[00:19:59] and I want to thank you for that because it's clear this has evolved from where it began in large part because of those meetings. On the townhouse parking one, you know, I still am challenged with our inability to enforce visitor parking versus regular parking, and I know we can't solve that with this, but I do think, you know, that's one of the significant problems and points of consternation in some of our townhome communities.

[00:20:23] But my question is, you know, I read through here about the director of LDS and when they might be triggered to be able to administratively approve something. Can you help describe for us again the boundaries of that?

[00:20:40] Because I would guess that the director of LDS would not want to really be in that position unless there were very exacting prescriptive language under which circumstances One could be getting administrative approval versus coming to the Board of Supervisors for approval.

[00:20:58] So if you can highlight those again for me, and then maybe if you can give us some context, looking backwards at the existing policies that are in place, what percent or rough idea of these would have gone that route if this provision had been in place earlier?

[00:21:15] Because I think it's a little overblown, but I just want to make sure of that. Well, one of the things that we have looked at very closely is the criteria under which we would review any particular proposal. For example, shared parking, we have very clear criteria about how an engineer would define that in their request.

[00:21:41] And then staff would have to evaluate that to make sure that the sharing arrangement is appropriate, that it's appropriately applied. and that there's a level of comfort that that sharing can occur. I mean, the clearest case of shared parking that we could have would be a situation where you would have an office development and a residential development.

[00:22:04] The office development would have a peak demand during the daytime and residential at night. So that's one example. The other examples that we have involve transit reductions, where you have to meet a clear set of criteria in order to qualify for a transit reduction. You have to be close to transit.

[00:22:20] You have to have other factors associated with the development. So there's a rigorous process that goes in for staff to make a recommendation to the board or if the staff is going to take or the director can take administrative action. Historically, most of the parking reductions that we receive are related to either shared parking or transit reductions.

[00:22:42] So those are the primary ones that we consider. One of the things that we've tried to nuance as part of this project is where the board should come in to consider a reduction. And currently what we're looking at is a situation where there are unique circumstances with a site where it's really should be moved up to the board level for consideration.

[00:23:06] And then the public benefit proposal that we have where there are, it's more of a subjective conversation about how they've met that and whether or not a reduction is appropriate that the board would take that on rather than the director.

[00:23:23] As far as the percentage reductions are concerned, in comparing reductions that we've received over the last few years versus what they would be under parking reimagined, those percentage reductions would also go down significantly.

[00:23:38] so you know we might have a reduction today that was and it's rare something more than 50 percent with the new rates that potentially are adopted by the board that could go down to 30 or even less depending on the circumstances so that kind of gives you a broad evaluation of where we are with parking how we look at parking and you know where we think we'll be going forward okay and so in in what we're advertising, that level of specificity is what we're advertising. In other words,

[00:24:13] the cases that would go for an administrative approval, the criteria for them, the strictness of that criteria is what's being advertised. In other words, we wouldn't be broadening that from where we are today. If anything, we'd be further restricting it, if anything at all, but we certainly wouldn't be broadening it. For the ones that we are recommending would have the ability for an administrative approval, we have either retained the criteria that we have or we have tightened that criteria as part of these discussions. Okay. I think that's important because I appreciate the process and the speed going that route might be versus coming to the

[00:24:52] board, and we don't need to be reviewing all of these. But I also wanted to assure the public and us that we're not putting the director of LDS in an impossible situation or that people are thinking that this is just a subjective transaction of you know how the director is feeling that day and and that's not what this is at all and i have heard things about the board turning over uh its authority and and you know i think there are cases where that makes sense but we are setting the criteria under which that authority is turned over to the director of lds and i just wanted to

[00:25:27] make sure that was clear so thank you thank you thank you um supervisor thank you very much madam Chair, a couple of questions. One on the affordable housing adjustment, and I see the proposal is to basically change it. So basically in projects with AMI 70% below, then that would be allowed. And in the introduction, it says that there could be, I believe, up to a 25% reduction. Is that correct? And I guess my follow-on question is, is that 25%

[00:26:05] off of whatever it's been reduced to? In other words, if it's a transit-oriented project, would you get a double adjustment, or would it just be a single? Well, the draft that we have today, we'd originally proposed a 25% adjustment in the November information that we provided to the board and to the public,

but we have continued to evaluate that, and part of the criteria associated with the proposal in November was that you could pull out affordable housing within a market rate development

[00:26:45] and create a lower parking requirement for that. And we just felt like that was going to be difficult to manage. So we've changed the language so that we don't have a specific percentage identified. It's more open-ended with regard to the percentage reduction that would be considered, but it does apply to the entire building or development that would meet the affordable criteria.

[00:27:11] So that, you know, we've set up the criteria, the threshold to meet, which is the 70 percent AMI target, but we haven't identified a particular percentage associated with that. Okay, that's helpful. I couldn't find the 25 percent in the text.

[00:27:27] So, all right, so basically it would be more open-ended at this point for affordable units. Yeah, I do have – I guess I want to think about this a little more because I know we definitely want to have more affordable housing.

[00:27:45] I also don't want to see us in a situation, though, where in the spirit of one Fairfax, that we're basically facilitating affordable housing in a way that, frankly, the people that live there don't have enough parking. So obviously we're going to need to balance that a little bit.

[00:28:03] My other question is relating to shared parking. appreciate the changes uh that are helping um making more clear where shared parking is allowed as we've talked before you know we have in some of our commercial centers and Tyson's parts of rest and other places we have an incredible uh surplus of privately owned parking um and many times adjacent to new development that's coming in where we're also asking for people to put parking. I think it looks to me, and I was going to ask what else we might be doing, it looks like

[00:28:42] we're doing a pretty good job allowing more shared parking. But my question is, what if anything is in here that would facilitate the use of more shared parking, particularly where, again, we have that situation. I know we have it all over the county, where we have new projects coming in very close to ones that have way more parking than ever gets used. Well, one of the things that we've been looking at recently is I've talked to our consultant to see if there

[00:29:16] are other experiences around the country where it's a little bit more prescriptive with regard to requiring shared parking. It's a struggle, I will say, because you have two private entities who both have their self-interest at heart. And most jurisdictions try to encourage having those types of relationships to create shared parking, but there aren't a lot of jurisdictions that we've found that actually have sort of a mandate for that. However, in the Columbia Pike form-based

[00:29:51] code district in Arlington, they do have specific criteria that say that you have to share for every thousand square feet of gross floor area, you have to provide one shared space if you're redeveloping a site. So I just, we've just seen that language, or I have actually, I haven't really shared it with the rest of the team yet because I just was looking at it today as a matter of fact anticipating your question so we'll take a look at that and see how that could apply it may be kind of limited with regard to maybe looking at Tyson's or arrest in the TOD areas

[00:30:30] and having having that apply in that area but it's something that we need to take a closer look at to see if we have that tool in a toolbox that we can include as part of this proposal thank you very much i really appreciate you looking at other models because i you know it's it if we can crack that nut i think we'll

be making we'll be doing amazing things for affordability for new housing you know for basically we won't be wasting uh resources and nobody will be wasting wasting resources that we don't need and certainly it's in our interest to get that parking utilized so

[00:31:10] that people aren't building more parking, you know, if they can share these parking areas that we have an abundance of in Tyson's, then that's something that, you know, is going to be a net benefit. Yeah, and I would just point out, too, particularly in our growing areas, like emerging areas like Tyson's and other TOD areas, to me, this is a more of a time-limited need. I would expect for some period of time, and I don't know, you know, 10 years, who knows, maybe longer, that I could see this really being the shared portion of it being really critical.

[00:31:44] But over time, as more amenities appear, as these communities truly emerge and can become more self-sustaining without using your car, then I think I can see the need declining over time. But thank you so much for looking into that more.

[00:32:01] I think that, for me, this is a big one. So thank you. You're welcome. Any other questions? Supervisor Faust. Thank you. I think the, first of all, I think the general introductory statements that you made are, you know, it's all good stuff, and I agree with it.

[00:32:29] Some of the devils are in the details on this. At least that's what we're hearing. And so, first of all, a 20% reduction for landscaping. What is that?

[00:32:45] I mean, you determine, based on all these reduced parking requirements, you determine what the requirement is, and then you reduce it by another 20% if somebody's willing to do landscaping? What we have found, based on my personal experience and others who work with landowners and tenants, there has been a struggle with meeting the parking lot landscaping requirements as they are today through the urban forester and a conflict with that with meeting a minimum parking requirement.

[00:33:25] So what we're trying to do in the ordinance is to build in some flexibility. Enhancing green is a critical issue that has come up as part of this project. And so what we want to do is, without damaging the parking needs for a particular site, if we can get more green as a tradeoff, I mean, typically it's a few spaces to be able to create landscaping islands within a parking lot or some tree pits or something like that.

[00:33:56] It's not generally a significant number of spaces that are taken away in order to meet these landscaping requirements. So from that point of view, we were trying to get a good tradeoff of finding the right parking supply and finding the right landscaping for these sites.

[00:34:16] 20%, in my opinion, is not insignificant. And landscaping should be a requirement. But it shouldn't be a, you know, if the developer is willing to, you know, if we are willing to reduce the parking requirement by 20%, the developer might be willing to plant some trees.

[00:34:36] I mean, there's a lot of things that are really good about reducing the amount of parking, but you still are going to be left with some ugly parking lots that need to be, you know, transitioning into walkable spaces and attractive spaces, environmentally friendly spaces.

[00:34:57] Coming up with a substantially reduced number of parking spaces and then whacking that by 20% just to get some trees, in my opinion, is the wrong path. We've got to require this stuff. That's why the

fact that we're following up with landscaping requirements after we adopt a parking ordinance, to me, they should be done concurrently.

[00:35:26] because landscaping and making those parking lots green and attractive is as important as getting the parking numbers right, as far as I'm concerned. The authority of the LDS director, we may accept 60%, but the public never will.

[00:35:50] I mean, that is, you know, right now it's 30%. It's not an issue. It comes, if somebody wants 40%, it comes to us as an administrative item, and the board approves it. we don't typically don't disprove it but it gives the public access to the board member because he knows public knows we're going to have to vote on it and so it doesn't become an issue but if it was an issue there's a there's a public there's an opportunity for the public to to talk to us

[00:36:23] one of the you know i i i like your numbers definitely the ranges i think you know we can figure out a way to live with those and make them work and the world would be a better place But from what I, the feedback I'm getting from the public, it's not supportive to a large degree, but it's more questioning.

[00:36:52] And I am told that they've been asked, you've been asked over and over again for, how did you come up with the numbers? What data are you pointing to? You say in your materials that staff has done extensive research of multifamily parking demand.

[00:37:13] Share that with the public. you know, they deserve that. On affordable housing, we should have a separate category, in my opinion, and we should get it as low as we possibly can. If you have 60% AMI living next to a transit stop, a metro station, I don't think you're going to see the same number of cars.

[00:37:37] That's my guess. Again, what do the data suggest? But reducing that cost of parking for affordable housing would have a dramatic impact on the number of units we can build. Now I go back to the trees and the greens.

[00:37:55] I mean, we need, it's so fundamentally essential to getting parking right that it should be done at the same time. Thank you. Any other questions? Supervisor Herity.

[00:38:11] No, I'll just, townhome parking was brought up earlier. Townhomes probably are example of what we don't want to see happen with this, and that is is we don't build enough parking and we've got our townhouse every one of us i think has got a townhouse community that regularly beats us up over not enough parking um developers never build in my my experience never build more parking than they have to because it costs them money it costs some units and costs them everything else so i'm not not a big fan of of maximums and and i will echo supervisor faust i don't understand that 20 reduction if you come up with what's needed Why in the world would you take 20% off of that?

[00:38:53] You know, if we feel the need to do landscaping, do landscaping, but don't reduce parking 20% to do landscaping. We're just asking for issues down the road. So those are a couple of my issues with it and a couple of my inputs. I'll save the rest for later.

[00:39:10] Thank you. Okay, going once, going twice. All right. I want to thank you all for all the work you've done to be here prepared for questions and that you'll continue to work with the community and the Planning Commission on the board.

[00:39:29] And this meeting is adjourned. Thank you. Good job.



Coraggio Consulting · aguyonx.com