

MEETING NOTES

DATE: July 7, 2015

SUBJECT: Residential Parking Advisory Committee Meeting #3

<https://www.cctv.org/watch-tv/programs/draft-residential-parking-management-plan>

ITEM 1: Attendees

The following Advisory Committee members were present:

- John King, BPD
- Jim Barr, UVM /DPW Commission
- Max Tracy, TEUC
- Caryn Long, Ward 1
- Sandy When Ward 1 (in place of Richard Hillyard)
- Tony Redington, Ward 2/3
- Phil Hammerslough, Ward 2/3
- Abby Mattera, Ward 5
- Charles Simpson, Ward 6

The project team present for the meeting was:

- Nicole Losch, Burlington DPW
- Chapin Spencer, Burlington, DPW
- Peter Keating, CCRPC
- Robert Chamberlin, RSG
- David Grover, RSG

ITEM 2: Introduction to Presentation

Chapin explains the purpose of this study, to review the residential parking program, and why it has come about. There have been a number of issues over the 25 years since residential parking was implemented.

ITEM 3: Mayor's comments

There has been quite a bit of discussion within the community about this study, I want to be clear that I'm paying attention to this issue, working with Chapin, and following the debate. I hope that people take from this report that the city is listening.

The residential program serves a real need and no one wants to remove this program. That's a different question than are there adjustments that we can consider changing for the program. It makes sense to do this review after 25 years. The program has grown substantially and there are changes in the City such as changes in the downtown.

The next steps are that this plan will be presented to the Public Works Commission next week, but no action will be taken at that meeting. There are many other steps after this.

Comment: Please explain the real need of the residential parking program.

Mayor: It was first instituted in the Centennial Field Neighborhood. The core values of the program is that residents should be able to park when they come home at night, and they should be able to have guests park near their home. There have been other quality of life issue, e.g. cut through traffic on dead end streets.

Comment: The original intent of the program was that the residents did not feel like their streets should be parking lots for baseball games. It was expanded elsewhere where people could not find parking on their streets.

Mayor: Since this study began approximately a year ago, there has been another study going on. We are putting quite a bit of energy into the ten year capital plan, examining what are the assets that we are committed to maintaining and what would we like to expand on, e.g. the bike path. We published a draft of the plan this spring, submitted to the city council, we just passed a budget that will fund the first year.

There is a gap between what we have funding sources for and what we want to maintain, particularly in sidewalks and streets. We will replace about 2 miles of the 90 miles of City streets. I think we should be talking about commuter permits to see if there is a way to protect all of the important values of the residential parking program, especially from non-property taxpayers.

Caryn commented that she supports what was said earlier. She received residential parking on Henry street due to Medical Center employees parking on their street. It really took away from the quality of life. She and her kids bike, and park cars are not safe. It doesn't seem like a good way to raise money.

ITEM 4: Consultant Presentation

Bob presented the findings and recommendations to date from this study.

RSG was retained by the city to do this study. The public input is incredibly important. The project team is on front porch forum and hears what people are saying.

Bob explained the project steps:

- Overview of public outreach
- Overview of Best Practices



- Highlights of best practices
- Overview of strategies
 - 4 current strategies
 - 10 new ones

ITEM 5: Public Comments: Advisory Committee

Charles: Resident only parking is one of the most democratic of policy creations. A move to area parking affirms this democracy. There is a movement to move satellite parking and mass transit, but nothing specific is mentioned in the report. The study mentions that there is no impact of resident only parking on property values. A realtor said that there is a very positive value to resident only parking. Also Boston offers free residential parking.

Tony: This study needed to happen. The basic value of a surface parking space is about \$600 per year. A parking garage space is about \$2200 per year. This should be reflected in the study. Some of the parking should be repurposed for bicycle lanes, but that's not in the report. The first recommendation is to support sustainable transportation, which includes bicycles and zero emission vehicles. When talking about safe bicycling, that means cycle tracks. Consider the needs for safe bicycle infrastructure. While the plan is good, it needs to consider the need for this safe infrastructure. Lastly, the population has decreased by 200 people, people are aging, there are more seniors, that means there will be a need to repurpose some of the parking for these people.

Phil: The first thing that was spoken of was that this is public space, public means people. We are so car centric, but cars are not compatible in a city such as Paris, London, Mexico City. Kids used to play in the streets, but they can't do that around cars. We all use cars, but we need to increase our multimodal transportation. In a neighborhood where 98% of the people are transient, how do you get the property owners to go along with this? Consider the idea of leapfrogging, so that we are using the streets for family. It is difficult for families to get out into the streets, 80% of people who would like to bicycle don't feel safe.

Sandy: Question about the University's parking plan. Two of the institutions have a huge impact on parking. What is the University's parking plan? How does this fit into those plans. She is in real estate, the value of your home is reflected in if you have a parking space. Approves of using organizations that have extra space, e.g. churches. It would be good if DPW will manage it. When there was a winter ban, years ago when you could not park on the streets all winter, where did the institutions put all of their cars then?

Comment: One of the big issue in heavily rented neighborhoods is parking on green space, and that is polluting our waterways, so why do we allow parking on the lawns, and green spaces? Before the City considers reducing parking requirements, it needs to figure out how to deal with lawn parking.

Jim: Echoes the idea of enforcing ban on parking on lawns. Striping parking spaces is important to prevent blocking of driveways.

Concerned with strategy #9: transferable permits. If somebody lives in a dwelling and purchases two permits and only uses one, how will it be guaranteed that they don't let someone who doesn't live there use that second pass?

If it becomes zone based instead of street based, why would these new places be forced to have commuter permits when existing streets are not forced to? How would that be fair to these new places?

Bob: It would be required in every case for new streets, the public works commission would evaluate whether it makes sense. There would have to a study to determine if there is capacity and demand.

Jim: I live on Chase Street, where it's all renters. They would not be interested in residential parking.

Max: It feels like it's people who are better off in better homes getting a benefit. For example in Ward 2 where it's mostly renters they don't have these benefits. If only do homeowners who live there can request residential parking, it favors people who have additional time, can follow the public process, who aren't working 2 or 3 jobs. This study must be understood not in isolation but in conjunction with the Downtown plan and the bike/ped master plan. Understand how changing parking minimums will affect residential parking, and what is the class dynamic. For example, if we take away the downtown minimum, the downtown parking will spill into rental neighborhoods, and how will they be able to take care of this?

Specificity is key in the lawn-parking ban. Who should people go to to address this? It has been a problem for a while.

Park and ride lots are a big thing in the city right now. There may be a desire to park outside the city, and this hasn't been reported in this report or the downtown one.

Jim: Addressing the intermodal facility at Exit 14, there isn't funding for it right now, it was earmarked funding, that isn't available right now.

Max: It would be great to recognize this in the study since it is being talked about.

Abby: I like that the plan is trying to utilize existing capacity rather than build new capacity. I support that piece of the plan. There may also be a chance to repurpose parking for other uses along main corridors. We also should give people a way to get downtown without using the roads. 40% of our citizens are drivers, so addressing the public means helping walking and biking. I also support repurposing parking downtown.

Sandy: where does the 40% come from?

Abby: That accounts for everyone, including children and elderly.

Nicole summarized the points so far:

- Expand specificity in terms of park and rides, satellite lots, lawn parking
- Mixed comments on charging of permit fees,
- Talk about tax implications
- Talk about coordinating City parking policies with those of the institutions



- Illegal parking on lawns, specifics on how that will be enforced
- Consider how transferable passes may be used by non-residents.
- How will this project affect lower income residents?
- How will this plan tie into the broader plans (e.g. downtown, walk-bike)

ITEM 6: Public comments: General Public

Comment: All for charging for passes, but the implementation is flawed. Currently, the sticker has to be linked to a license plate, with transferable passes, it will be easy to sell. Someone was selling passes for \$100 per month. Right now, the guest passes, per ordinance, must be use by someone visiting. I would call the police when I saw I violation and tell them that they had to knock on someone's door and see if the person was there. The police were not helpful and were resistant to enforcing guest pass violations unless pushed. The pass needs to be linked to a residence and a license plate.

The other question was about the \$75 citation. There was talk about changing the amount. Is there still talk about changing that?

Chapin: No, there isn't discussion to change it.

Comment: I really appreciate the process of this. Both the plan and the comments that have come out after demonstrates public support. We are on a dead end street, we had a lot of non-residents parking on our street, and an ambulance couldn't get through. Over parking is a safety issue. It's good to know that you can knock on the door so that someone would move their car. The change to area parking would be a problem because you wouldn't know whose car it is. I love the idea of having the cost to limit the number of cars. I also have kids in the area who are renters, they're not all bad. The approved landlord, I love that you're thinking beyond that. I think it's better to have the person who lives there, they will be more invested. I think that the landlord won't try to find parking spaces, if he can get away with renting it without them.

Comments: There had been talk about public thoroughfares. Our roads are built by city dollars, that includes tax dollars, including from renters. We are already paying for the maintenance and building of these streets. I'm surprised that we are willing to sell this to out of town commuters. The major issues discussed here is what is the quality of life, can we get more money out of our streets, and there's a plan to develop Burlington a lot. Is the plan to expand parking permits to accommodate all of this additional development? We should be dealing with how to keep neighborhoods livable. I'm not sure if selling permits on city streets is the way to deal with tough fiscal times. People who live here are paying for the streets.

Comment: The capital plan: only \$16 million of the \$62 million is for maintenance, the rest is for expansion. I'm not sure that there's public buy in on all that. The part on sustainable transportation sounds like it is written by someone who owns a bus company. There should be more talking about biking and walking and the rest of the strategies should follow to help bikes and walkers. It should talk about people using satellite parking coming in from out of town, not just students. That would reduce parking on residential streets. I think that parking in zones is a bad idea because a developer will create a huge building that will pass on it's parking needs to the rest of the zone. The zone issue was to help address corner lots. I live on a zone boundary, so it's not going to help my corner lot. I'm



also against zones because it ties into reducing parking needs for downtown parking needs. It will lead to abuse of people who want to house a lot of people.

Ithaca: I've lived there, I'm familiar with it, I've lived in College town. We don't want to create this. 90% of the information in the report is wrong about Ithaca. I met with the director of parking there and he said it's wrong. I should meet with you after. Example include: residents have to switch sides of street. That's not true. In Ithaca, you receive only 2 permits per building if it's a single family home. In Burlington, we give unlimited permits per building. An 8-unit apartment building get 32 passes with this plan. Don't do it by dwelling unit, do it by house. You should get 2 or 4 permits per building, not dwelling unit, that's how they do it in Ithaca. Permits per bedrooms is even more ridiculous. We don't need all neighborhoods to look alike. In Ithaca, they only want 20% parking on the street. In the report where you say permits per household, household is not defined, change it to dwelling unit, or home.

A lot of this report looks like it was influenced by UVM, and there's a conflict of interest here.

License plate reader: They make a ton of money on this in Ithaca, It pay for itself and is a very effective way to regulate parking.

Comment: I live on a street with low utilization and residential restrictions. I'm concerned with guest passes not being appropriately used. Giving 4 passes for 180\$ is not going to work. The vast majority of households use those passes appropriately. Our house will store our car on the street and walk downtown. This method will encourage me to go outside of town rather than have a guest come to my house. All of my neighbors appropriately use the current system. The people who are parking in neighborhoods instead the parking garage can't afford to pay for the parking garage. You're not going to be able to raise a lot of money here. Taking away onsite parking doesn't make sense in the Snowbelt.

Comment: The 4 permits is related to 4 unrelated residents rule, but the landlords are required to provide a parking space, so we are rewarding landlords who did not provide the required parking space.

Comment: If you look at the grand list, properties that have residential parking have a higher value than those that don't. We live in a place that has much higher tax values of comparable sized lots without residential parking.

Mayor: I can't respond to everything that was said tonight, I want to speak to one thing that has come up, and has come up in Front Porch Forum. I have been clear that I think we need additional development in the downtown. I think it will create much needed development. We have never wanted the residential parking study to support this development so that people can park on residential streets. I think that we have a perverse downtown parking policy, we've spent a lot of money on those assets. We put the downtown study on hold so that we can have this study to look into whether expanding the downtown will create added pressure on the residential neighborhoods. We want to be sure we are addressing this in this study.

ITEM 7: Next Steps

The committee would like to see this report again after these comments are incorporated.



Questions: What will the Commission vote look like? Is this all or nothing, can they just approve some things?

Nicole: At the July meeting, we will recap how we got to where we are. Then we will come back to the Commission for them to authorize the DPW to move these forward. They will have the option to change things after this, but when the final draft goes to them, they are voting on the final document as a whole. These strategies won't be adopted until they are brought forward as an ordinance.

Comments: There is a lot of concern that this will never be brought up to elected representatives.

Gene, City Council: The City charter is set up so that the Commission has sole say over parking. Charter change is the only way around this. The City Council has the option to inform the Commission.

Question: What about the parking minimums?

They are part of zoning, so that would be the Planning and Zoning Commission, the not Public Works Commission.

