



Questions Raised by Proposed Parking Resolution

1. Are you proposing to allow the market to determine whether and how much parking to provide everywhere in the city – in other words, to turn over municipal onsite parking regulation to the development and business community without input from nearby residents who will be affected?
2. We know there are consequences of requiring too much parking - the underutilization of land, added costs that are passed on to the consumer, and the facilitation of vehicular travel when other less environmentally impactful travel modes are feasible – but aren't there also consequences to providing too little parking such as increased traffic and congestion (caused by drivers cruising for parking spaces), illegal parking, and excessive curb parking on narrow streets and around public schools that create accessibility and safety issues?
3. One of the “whereas” statements in the Council’s resolution states that “eliminating parking requirements can promote more walkable and bikeable neighborhoods,” but isn’t it also true that excessive commercial spillover parking on neighborhood streets, most of which don’t have sidewalks, can make them less walkable and bikeable – even unsafe for children? If we eliminate parking requirements across the city, how do we protect against that?
4. One of the recommendations in the Austin Strategic Mobility Plan (p. 45, pdf p.71) is to “Assess, design, and implement location-specific parking that takes into consideration surrounding network capacity and supports increased multimodal and environmentally-friendly travel choices.” It also provides for “right-sizing the number of parking spaces provided in the future.” (p. X pdf 12; p. 45, pdf p.71) Those are different concepts from just eliminating parking minimums everywhere in the city, do you agree?

5. The Austin Strategic Mobility Plan calls for a systems approach to parking management that includes adopting curb management practices, shared and off-site parking, traffic demand management programs, dynamic parking management, using on-street parking in a context-sensitive manner, and coordination on a district level when appropriate. (p X pdf 12; pp 44-45 pdf 71-72) Some or all, or maybe other elements, need to be in place as a part of calibrating the appropriate on-site parking level before we eliminate parking minimums. Do you agree?
6. Do you think it is fair to relegate handicapped parking to the street as contemplated by the resolution which asks staff to make “recommendations for developments proposing no on-site parking that allow for accessible parking spaces on-street, adjacent to or reasonably nearby the development and located on an accessible route.”
7. Are you open, prior to implementing your policy change, to having City Staff evaluate the City’s existing parking regulations as applied in the community to determine the circumstances under which, or the uses for which, the City’s parking requirements fail to align with the publics’ parking needs (over-parking or under-parking) and then recommending how we best right-size our parking regulations including adding, reducing or eliminating parking when and where warranted instead of simply eliminating parking minimums across the board without consideration of use, conditions, or location? Isn’t this the responsible way to approach parking changes?
8. Are you open to letting the City Staff survey the published studies and experience in other cities to determine the effect reduced parking has on traffic generation and vehicle miles traveled and under what circumstances before we modify our parking regulations?
9. Do you think it is consistent with good practice and democratic principles for council members to propose a major policy change that will impact citizens across the city and adopt it nine days later on consent without notice to the public, a hearing for public input, staff review, or even council discussion?